THE DOCTRINE OF THE Glorious Trinity,

NOT

Explained, but Asserted

BY

Several Texts, as they are expounded by the ancient Fathers and later Divines.

For the Satisfaction of such as doubt, the Conviction of such as deny, and the Confirmation of such as believe this Mysterious Article of the CHRISTIAN FAITH.

Πίστευεις ὅτι μεγάλη ἡ ὁδὸς; μὴ ζήτει πως· Μὴ ζήτει τὰ ἀνεύρετα, ἢ οὐκ ἐυρήσεις.

Basil. M. adv. Calumn. S. Trin. p. 623. *Edit. Parisiis.*

Τὰ Θεῖα ἥνωται καὶ διακέκριται· Ὅπως ἢ, ταῦτά ἐστιν, ὅτε εἰπεῖν, ὅτε συνοῆσαι δυνατόν.

Dionys. Areop. de Div. Nom. p. 173, 174. *Edit. Lutetiæ Parisiorum.*

By *FRANCIS GREGORY*, D. D. and Rector of *Hambleden* in the County of *Bucks.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishop's-Head* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1695.

231
G862d

TO THE

Reverend, Pious, and Learned

Dr. *Richard Buſby*,

Prebend of *Weſtminſter*, and Chief Maſter of the ROYAL-SCHOOL there.

Honour'd SIR,

I Have made bold to prefix Your Name before this little Tract, knowing that it wants ſome Great Patronage, and therefore Yours; who are ſo able to confute them, who

1086072

oppoſe the Truth here aſſerted; and ſo willing to countenance ſuch, as own and would defend it. I was alſo ambitious, before You leave the World, to acquaint it with my great Obligations to You. If there be herein any groſs Miſtakes, they are mine; if there be any thing of Worth and Learning, I owe it to You; who, in my Minority, were to me, not a Maſter only, but even as a Father; and, which is a Relation more rarely found, a real Friend; for, I was not only protected under, but nouriſhed by, Your warm and cheriſhing Wing.

Such You were to me, and to Thouſands more; ſo that I may, within Truth, and without Flat-

Flattery, tell the World, That there is ſcarce any Man in it, who hath done more Good than You. To You doth the Church of *England* owe great ſtore of her choiceſt Divines; and it is no Fault of Yours, that I my ſelf am none of that happy Number. To You do the Cities and Towns of *England* owe very many of our ableſt Phyſicians; and to You doth *Weſtminſter-Hall*, both it's Barrs and it's Benches, owe many of our moſt Learned Lawyers. So that Your daily Care, Your unwearied Induſtry, and prudent Conduct, have had a very ſignal Influence upon every thing, that may prove moſt Advantageous to the Eſtates, Bodies,

and Souls of Men: And how can any Perſon oblige a Church or Nation more?

And were I not afraid to put Your great Modeſty to the bluſh; I think, I might juſtly ſay, That more Scholars, well grounded in the Principles of Morality, Piety, and Learning, have been trained up under Your happy Government, than were ever bred by any one Maſter, in any one School, ſince the World begun.

'Tis indeed much to be feared, that ſome of Your Scholars, who have proved debauched and vicious, will, in the Event, fare the worſe for that vertuous Example, and thoſe pious Inſtructions, which You often gave

gave them; for their Chriſtian Education in Your School and Family, will add many Ounces to the Weight of their Crimes, and double their Iniquities. Nor can we wonder, if ſuch profligate Wretches, inſtead of returning Thanks to their worthy Maſter, ſhould now and then drop ſome hard and undeſerved Speeches concerning him; acting too much like thoſe ungrateful Clouds, which darken the Sun, that raiſed them. But notwithſtanding this, the Honour of Your Name, like the Beams of the Sun diſſipating and breaking through ſuch empty Clouds, doth and will ſhine as bright as ever.

And

And now, as I am loath to diſpleaſe You by Publiſhing, ſo am I unwilling to injure the World by concealing Your exemplary Acts of Piety to God, and Charity to Men; Your erecting a decent Parochial Church for Divine Worſhip; a convenient Parſonage-Houſe for the Miniſter, and an Alms-Houſe for the Poor; Your frequent ſending conſiderable Supplies to Priſoners for Debt; Your relieving diſtreſſed Miniſters, turned out of all by the fury of blind Zealots, the Rabble, and Dregs of Mankind. But theſe things I only name, leaving them to be illuſtrated and recorded by ſome abler Pen, and tranſmitted to Poſterity as Great Examples, which

which all Men muſt commend, but, I fear, few will imitate, at leaſt in the ſame Degree and Eminence.

'Tis now high time to take my leave; and yet before I do ſo, I would beg one thing from You, and another thing for You; from You, I would beg a Pardon for this Preſumption; and for You, I would beg that Your Paſſage to Heaven may prove as eaſie, as, I know, 'tis ſafe; that when Your Candle ſhall grow near the Socket, it may not be extinguiſhed by any violent Storm, but expire of its ſelf, and go out only for want of Oil; that every Sand of Your Glaſs may run out gently and freely, even without a ſhake;

a ſhake; that You may do no more than quietly fall aſleep. So prayeth,

Your Obliged Scholar,

Affectionate Friend, and

Humble Servant,

Francis Gregory.

TO

TO THE

Christian Reader.

Good Reader,

THis little Tract, here presented to thy view, was very lately written, and is now published, not to gain Applause, for it deserves none; not to gain Money, for its Author is not mercenary; but to do Good, to defend a Truth, and a very great one too. Though it be not penned so well, as I do, and thou maist wish, yet the Justice of its Author's Design may somewhat excuse and atone for the Imperfections

perfections *of the* Work *it self. And the rather, because it may be hoped, that this* attempting *a* weak *Defence, may provoke some abler Person to* make *a* strong *one.*

Jude 1. *We are all commanded,* To contend earnestly for the Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints. *This Faith stands recorded in our Bibles; this Faith hath the Catholick Church embraced and vigorously maintain'd against all its Opposers. And for this Faith must we also contend, though it be with* Blood; *not by* shedding other *Mens; but, if just occasion should so require, by* losing *our* own. *We must likewise contend for this Faith, as well as we can, by strength of* Argument; *but our chief Weapon, to be used in this Quarrel, is,*

The

The Sword of the Spirt, *and that must be fetched and drawn from the* Armoury *of God; for,* there is none like that. 1 Sam. 21. 9.

With this Divine Sword did the great Champions of this Faith in the Four first General Councils *contend against* Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, *and* Macedonius; *with the same Sword did the* Fathers, *who were famous both for* Piety *and* Learning *both in the* Eastern *and* Western *Churches, contend against all the* Heresies, *which arose in their respective Ages. And of the same Weapon have we need enough in this unhappy Age of ours.*

For, we find that Prophecy of St. Peter's *fulfilled this Day in* England, *which saith,* There shall be false Teachers among you, 2 Pet. 2. 1.

who

who shall privily bring in damnable Heresies, *and the only damnable Heresie, which he particularly names, is this*, even denying the Lord, that bought them. *There are indeed several ways of denying our Lord; but of them all, I think, the denying of his* Divinity *is the* worst. *For that denieth the highest* Dignity *of his* Person, *the Infinite* value *of his* Satisfaction; *and, by a necessary consequence, the* Redemption *of the World by his Blood.*

We grant indeed, that if it had been the good Pleasure of God so to do, he might freely *have forgiven the Sin of Man; but since, for the* Glory *of his* Justice, *he was pleased to demand a Satisfaction that might be proportionable to the Infi-*

nite

nite guilt of Sin, and the Contempt thereby offered to his Infinite Power and Holiness; if our Lord and Surety had been no more, than Arius, *and his unhappy Spawn* Socinus, *allowed him to be,* Ἄνθρωπος λιτὸς καὶ γυμνός, *a mere* naked Man, *stript of Divinity, his Blood, though never so Innocent, must have been too* cheap *a Sacrifice for Sin. But St.* Paul *hath told us,* God hath purchased his Church with his own Blood; *i. e. with the Blood of that Sacred Person, who was* God *as well as* Man; Man, *that he might have Blood to shed; and* God, *that his blood might be of sufficient value.*

Besides, they, who deny the Divinity of our Lord and his Holy

Spirit, whom we own and adore *as* God, *do charge the whole* Christian Church *with* Idolatry; *and if so, if all they are counted Idolaters, who do Religiously worship our Lord and his Spirit; this Lord of ours, and this Spirit of his, must in these Men's esteem be reckon'd* Idols. *And what Blasphemy can be worse? What more damnable than this?*

And yet this Opinion, as bad as it is, amongst the croud of other Errors, is now revived amongst us, and to the shame of our Nation, the ruine of Souls, and for a punishment of our gross Irreligion and foul Immoralities, is permitted to grow and spread. Now, to preserve my own little Flock from the Infection of this Pestilent Heresie,

ſie, *I wrote this little Tract; and becauſe it may be of ſome uſe, as well to ſome other Perſons, as to thoſe of my own Charge; remembring the old Rule,* Bonum, quò communius, eò melius, *I was induced to make it publick.*

Now, if any, who do already believe the Doctrine of the Glorious Trinity, *ſhall be more* confirmed *hereby in their preſent Faith; if any, who yet waver in their Judgments about this Doctrine, ſhall hereby be better* ſatisfied *of its Certainty and Truth; or if any, who yet deny this Doctrine, ſhall hereby be* convinced *of their Error, and recant it; as I ſhall* obtain *my* End, *ſo let* God *Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, have all the* Glory. *Amen.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE *Glorious Trinity*, NOT Explained, but Aſſerted.

IT is our great misfortune to live in this unhappy and licentious Age, wherein the Ancient and *Apoſtolical Government* of the *Church* is reduced almoſt to a perfect *Anarchy*; in ſo much that Men of corrupted Minds have took occaſion from a *general Liberty*, allowed in favour to tender Conſciences, to vent and ſpread ſeveral *erroneous Opinions*, and ſome *damnable Doctrines*,

whereby they have already ſeduced, and are very like eternally to ruine, a great Number of ignorant and too credulous Souls.

'Tis certain that the Hereſies of *Arius*, *Sabellius*, *Macedonius*, *Socinus*, and their Abetters, are more dangerous, and conſequently more to be abhorred, than any of thoſe Errors, which are taught by the Roman Church, which are ſaid, *Fundamentum tangere*, to touch and ſtrike at the Foundation of our Chriſtian Faith, and that is bad enough; but the fore-named Hereſies, which deny the Divinity of Chriſt and his Holy Spirit, the Trinity of Perſons in the Glorious Godhead, and our Lord's Satisfaction to his Father's Infinite Juſtice for the ſin of Man, do *Fundamentum tollere*, quite ſubvert and root up the main Foundation of our Faith, and that is a great deal worſe.

Theſe *Hereſies* are juſtly chargeable with ſome tincture of *Atheiſm*;

theiſm; for, though the Defenders of them do *acknowledge* a *God*, yet they *contract* and limit the *Deity*, by denying it in the *Second* and *Third Perſons*, in whom it doth as *really* and as *certainly* ſubſiſt, as in the *Firſt*. Now, amongſt the croud of Hetrodox Opinions, which, ſince the late variety of our Civil Revolutions, through the great Indulgence of our Governors, have been broached and ſpread amongſt us; theſe Peſtilent Hereſies, long ſince very juſtly condemned by the Catholick Church, have crept in, and found entertainment amongſt ſuch Perſons, as make, not the Word of God, but humane Reaſon, the Ground of their Faith.

Theſe abominable Hereſies being thus revived by Men, who bear and engroſs to themſelves the Name of *Unitarians*, as a mark of diſtinction, as if other Men, who own the *Trinity* of *Perſons*, did not alſo own the *Unity* of

God; ſeveral Divines of the Church of *England*, Perſons of *great Piety* and *excellent Parts*, both natural and acquired, have endeavoured to *explain* this Myſterious Doctrine of the Trinity, with a deſign to *acquit* it from thoſe Abſurdities, Contradictions, and that Impoſſibility; with all which it ſtands unjuſtly charged by its Oppoſers.

But although theſe ſeveral Explications were very piouſly intended by their reſpective Authors; I mean, to render this abſtruſe Doctrine the more intelligible and eaſie to the Apprehenſions of Men, to remove all Scruples about it, and to obviate all Exceptions againſt it; yet it is too evident, that theſe Explications have not yet obtained any happy Succeſs; and it is to be feared, that they never will attain that bleſſed End, for which they were deſigned. For,

1. Theſe

1. These Explications of this Doctrine, were they never so convincing and satisfactory in themselves, and to learned Persons; yet illiterate Men, who are the far greater part of Mankind, and do most need the plainest Instructions, can never receive any benefit from them; for, these Explications being full of nice distinctions, and dressed up in Logical, Metaphysical, and Scholastick Terms; unlearned Men, who are perfect strangers to such hard Notions, can never understand them.

2. These Explications of this Doctrine have not proved convincing and satisfactory to those learned Men, who have been, and still are its Opposers. For, they yet raise Objections against it, and still testifie as great a dislike of these Explications, as of the Doctrine it self intended to be explained. Nay, they are so far from being satisfied, either with the Doctaine or its Explications, that

that they have took occaſion from the one to ridicule and ſcoff at both.

Conſiderations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 10. 11.

For the bleſſed Trinity, as its Doctrine ſtands explained by ſeveral Men, is ſtyled by way of Sarcaſm and Irriſion, The *Ciceronian*, the *Carteſian*, the *Platonick*, and the *Peripatetick* Trinity; as if this great Doctrine were founded upon, and could be maintained by, not the *Scriptures*, but the *Schools*. I am perſuaded, that we had never heard of theſe and the like baſe Affronts and Contumelies againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity, had we never heard of ſuch and ſuch its Explications.

That late Explication, written by an acute Divine of the Church of *England*, is, as its Author hath very learnedly proved, the very Sentiment of the ancient *Fathers* and *Schoolmen*; and he, that ſhall attempt to pen a better, hath very good luck, if he do not ſtumble upon a worſe. And yet as plauſi-

ble

ble as that Explication is, as being invented and approved by Men of great Abilities; yet amongſt our modern *Socinians* it hath but a very ill Character indeed. It's true, they are ſo juſt as to commend the Judgment of that eminent Perſon, who collected it, telling us, *That it is a true and Oxthodox Explication of what the Church intends to ſay*; but as to the Explication it ſelf, they preſently brand it with the moſt ignominious Terms, and ſay; *That it is a great Untruth, a great piece of Non-ſenſe, neither Rational, nor Intelligible, nor Poſſible.*

A Reproach moſt inſufferable! A Remark moſt ſhamefully reflecting, not upon that learned *Divine*, who only delivered the Senſe of the Church; but upon the univerſality of thoſe ancient *Fathers* and *Schoolmen*, whoſe Authorities are cited by him; as if Senſe and Reaſon, Learning and Divinity, were no where elſe to be found, ſave

ſave only in *Socinus*, *Crellius*, *Epiſcopius*, and their Abetters.

Since therefore the Event of theſe late Explications, how well ſoever deſigned, hath proved no better; I think it may be wiſhed, that they had been ſpared; and the rather, becauſe they have not only expoſed this great Doctrine of the bleſſed Trinity to the Obloquies and Contempt of its profeſſed *Adverſaries*; but they have occaſion'd hot Diſputes, open Conteſts, and bitter Animoſities, betwixt ſome of its known *Friends*. For, the Explications of this Doctrine being very different, ſome of our own Divines, even Men of great Abilities and Reputation in the *Church* of *England*, who do perfectly agree in the Truth and Subſtance of this Myſterious Doctrine, do as much diſagree in its Explications.

That ſo it is, we learn from that late and learned Book of *Animadverſions*, wherein one Divine hath effectually

effectually overthrown the *new Hypotheſis* of another; and too juſtly charg'd its Author, that inſtead of maintaining the *Trinity* in *Unity*, he had, by an unwary Expreſſion, opened a gap for *Tritheiſm*, the unhappy Brood of *John Philoponus*. It muſt be confeſſed that this Book of *Animadverſions* was framed by a *Rational Head*, and written with a *Golden Pen*, but too deeply dipt in *Vinegar* and *Gall*; a Book, which, I think, had been much more *commendable*, had it been much leſs *Satyrical*; at leaſt conſidering that high Poſt, wherein the Perſon ſo treated ſtands; and that the *Tritheiſm*, with which he is charged, might be charitably imputed to an *over-ſight*, a σφάλμα, the *ſlip* of an inconſiderate Pen, ſince 'tis very far from being his avowed *Profeſſion*.

But, alas! all Men cannot learn that curious Art, which the Epigrammatiſt commends, *Parcere perſonis, dicere de vitiis*, ſo to diſtinguiſh

ſtinguiſh betwixt *Crimes* and *Perſons*, ſo to abſtract the *Fault* from the *Man*, that commits it, as to cenſure the one, yet not expoſe the other; at leaſt not in the higheſt manner, not ſo far, as any Man's Envy can provoke, or Wit enable.

Such ſad Inconveniencies, and ſuch deplorable Conteſts have aroſe from the Endeavours of Men to explain this Myſterions Doctrine, which indeed can never be well explained.

Nor indeed can we wonder that it ſhould be ſo; for, 'tis juſt with God to blaſt the Attempts of Men, who make bold to peep within that Curtain, which he himſelf hath drawn; and to pry into thoſe *Arcana*, thoſe Matters, which he hath thought fit as yet to conceal from us. That we might direct our worſhip aright, it hath been the good Pleaſure of God ſo far to reveal to us the Doctrine of the Trinity, as to aſſure us, *quòd ſit*, That

That there are indeed Three Glorious Perſons in the Deity to be adored; but, *quomodò ſit*, how it ſhould be ſo, the Scriptures do not inform us; nor do they allow us, much leſs oblige us, curiouſly to enquire into it.

'Tis well ſaid by one of the *Greek* Fathers, Ἀπιστίας σημεῖον τὸ πῶς ζητεῖν. When God hath revealed any thing for a certain Truth, which the Reaſon of Man cannot readily comply with, if we diſpute the Matter with our ſelves or others, and demand, as the Virgin *Mary* did, *How can this be?* even ſuch an Enquiry is a very ſhrewd Argument, that we believe it not.' But although ſuch and ſuch revealed Truths may be far above the reach of humane Underſtandings; yet when we have a clear Revelation for it, our own Reaſon doth oblige us to believe every thing to be a Truth, which that God, who cannot Lye, hath diſcovered as ſuch, though we

our

our ſelves cannot comprehend it.

'Tis that we pretend to in ſome other Caſes; for, the Doctrine of the Trinity is not the only Article of our Chriſtian Faith, which tranſcends the Apprehenſion of humane Reaſon; there are ſome other Truths, which confound and puzzle our Underſtndings as well as this; and yet we commonly pretend to believe them. The *Creation* of this glorious Fabrick of Heaven and Earth without any præexiſtent Matter, is a thing ſo contrary to Reaſon, that it paſſed for an undoubted Maxim amongſt the old Philoſophers, *Ex nihilo, nihil fit*, of nothing, nothing can be made. And as for the *Reſurrection* of the Dead, the Reaſon of Man judged it a thing ſo abſolutely impoſſible, that when St. *Paul* preached it to the learned Men of *Athens*, they called him, ὁ σπερμολόγος, a mere Babler; and as for the Doctrine it ſelf, the Text ſaith,

ſaith, ἐχλεύασαν, they mocked, *Maxime ridiculum putantes Reſurrectionis myſterium*, ſaith *Lorinus*; They thought the Myſtery of the Reſurrection, for ſuch indeed it is, to be no better than a moſt ridiculous Fable.

So did *Celſus* in *Origen*, where he thus demands, Ποῖον σῶμα πάντῃ διαφθαρὲν δύντε ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν φύσιν; What Body, being once wholly corrupted, is in any capacity to be reſtored to its former Conſtitution? 'Tis that, ſaith he, which God οὔτε θελήσεται, οὔτε δυνήσεται, neither will do, nor can. And for that reaſon he ſtyles our recourſe to God's Omnipotence, ἀτοπωτάτην ἀναχώρησιν, a moſt abſurd Refuge; and ſo peremptorily concludes, That the Doctrine of the Reſurrection is, ἀπόπτυστον καὶ ἀδύνατον, abominable, and impoſſible. Origen. contra Celſ. l. 5. p. 240. Edit. Cantabrig.

Nor was *Celſus* alone in this Opinion: for it was indeed the general Opinion of the moſt

knowing Men in the Heathen World. *Pliny*, amongſt other things, which he thought to be beyond the Power of God, mentions theſe Two, *Mortales æternitate donare, vel revocare defunctos*, To keep mortal Men from ever dying, or to revive them being dead. And of the latter *Æſchylus* thus concludes, Ἅπαξ θανόντος ὅτις ἐς Ἀνάστασις. Of a Man once dead there is no Reſurrection. And *Tertullian* tells us, That this Opinion, *De una Omnium Philoſophorum Schola ſumitur.* Although the Immortality of Man's Soul was granted by many of the old Philoſophers; yet the Reſurrection of a dead Body diſſolved, corrupted, and crumbled into Duſt, and that Duſt diſſipated, ſcattered, and intermingled, was generally denied by them all, as being in their Opinion an utter Impoſſibility.

Tertul. de Reſur. Carnis.

Now, though the Creation of the World out of Nothing, and I may add, the framing of Man's Body,

Body, ſo very curiouſly wrought, *ex inhabili materia*, out of an untoward and unlikely matter, altogether unſuitable to ſuch a Production, and the Reſtitution of the ſame Body, though quite corrupted, out of the ſelf-ſame Duſt, though ſcatter'd and intermingled, of which it once conſiſted; though theſe Acts do puzzle the Reaſon of all Mankind, and that to ſuch a degree, as to be thought impracticable, and that by Men of choice Parts, and the moſt approved Underſtandings; yet we of the Chriſtian Church do acknowledge the Creation, as an Act already done; and the Reſurrection, as an Act that certainly will be, as undoubted Articles of our Creed.

Tell me then, How come we to believe the Creation of the World, and the Reſurrection of the dead, being things which have ſeemed impoſſible to great numbers of other rational and learned Men?

Certain I am, that the Ground of our Faith in both theſe Caſes can be nothing elſe, ſave only the written Word of God: For, we cannot think, without too much Arrogance, that our Underſtandings in theſe later days of the World, are ſo much improved, as to be able merely by their own natural Light to diſcover theſe Truths, and to baffle all Objections againſt them, with ſtronger Arguments, and clearer Evidence, than other Mens Reaſon could do in former Ages.

But it hath been the good Pleaſure of God in this laſt Age of the World to bleſs the Catholick Church with a Divine Revelation, and to tell us clearly, eſpecially in his Goſpel, That as he created the World in its beginning, ſo at its end he will raiſe the dead; and by virtue of ſuch Teſtimonies we muſt think our ſelves obliged to believe both, even though we cannot reſolve all Doubts, nor anſwer

anſwer all Objections framed againſt either. And if ſo, why ſhould we not, by virtue of a like Warrant, believe the *Trinity* of Perſons in the *Godhead*? 'Tis certain that *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, and our Lord's *Apoſtles*, were all inſpired Men; and ſince they were ſo, they are equally credible: Wherefore if we believe *Moſes*, when he tells us, *God created the Heavens and the Earth*; if we believe St. *Paul*, when he ſaith, *There ſhall be a Reſurrection both of the Juſt and the Unjuſt*; Why ſhould we not believe St. *John*, when he tells us, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven?* the Authority of which Text ſhall in due time, and a more proper place, be conſidered.

Gen. 1. 1.

Act. 24. 15.

1 Joh. 5. 7.

Now, ſince a Divine Revelation is enough to ſilence all the Objections of Humane Reaſon againſt any Truths that are Revealed, the beſt, and I think, the only way to confute all the Cavils of our Mo-

dern *Socinians* againſt the Doctrine of the bleſſed *Trinity* is, not to attempt an Explanation of the *manner* how theſe glorious Perſons are diſtinguiſhed, but by *Sacred Writ* to prove their *number*, and the *certainty* of their diſtinction. And were this once effectually done; were the *Unity* of the *Godhead* conſiſtent with, and ſubſiſting in the *Trinity* of *Perſons*, clearly demonſtrated even to vulgar Capacities by infallible Texts of Scripture, the *Socinian* Pretences of *Impoſſibility* muſt ceaſe for ever. For it is an old Rule and a true one, *Fruſtrà quæritur de poſſe, cùm conſtat de eſſe*; When once 'tis evident, that any thing certainly is ſo or ſo, it were prodigious Folly to enquire any more, whether it might be ſo. For 'tis another Rule, *Quicquid eſt in Actu, fuit in Potentia*; Whatſoever is in preſent actual Being, muſt needs be granted to have been in a former Capacity to be that which now it is. And

And upon this Conſideration, had thoſe worthy Men who have endeavoured to diſcover the *manner* how the Three Glorious Perſons in the *Trinity*, though they are but *One God*, do yet ſtand really diſtinguiſhed from one another; had they, I ſay, employed their great Abilities in proving the *certainty* of their Diſtinction, they had, I think, more effectually baffled the Oppoſers of this great Doctrine, and thereby done far better Service to the Chriſtian Church.

If it be ſaid, That this Work is happily done already; That the Doctrine of the *Trinity* hath been ſufficiently proved by ſeveral learned Men in ſeveral Ages, and ſo needs no further Proofs: I anſwer, for the ſame reaſon it needs no new *Explications* neither: For, have not the *Fathers* and *Schoolmen* already explained it as well as any *other Man* can hope to do? But withal, ſo long as there ſhall a-

riſe a new *Donatus* or *Pelagius*, there will be need enough of a new St. *Auſtin*: If there ſtart up another *Arius*, there is need enough of another *Athanaſius* too: So long as there ſhall be *new Oppoſers* of our Faith, it ſhould have *new Defenders*. When *old Hereſies* are revived, the *old Arguments* muſt be refreſhed, and newly muſter'd up againſt them.

Now, ſince this is the preſent and very unhappy Caſe of the *Church* of *England*; ſince old Hereſies, long ſince condemned by the Catholick Church, are now crept in amongſt us, and propagated by Men who bear a new Name; who, becauſe there can be but *One God*, deny the Poſſibility of a *Trinity* of *Perſons*, and charge the Doctrine of it with Contradictions, I ſhall endeavour, by the Divine Aſſiſtance, to make good this Doctrine, as to its *Truth* and *Certainty*.

To

To this end the uſe of *Philoſophical Arguments* from Humane Diſcourſe, ordinary *Topicks*, and Logical Concluſions, ſave only ſuch as are founded in, and drawn from the Word of God, would be vain; for the Reaſon of Man of it ſelf can never afford us any ſolid Proofs to confirm ſuch Doctrines, the Contents whereof do infinitely tranſcend its utmoſt Capacity. We find indeed, that Men, who are loath to believe what they cannot comprehend, have employed their Underſtandings to find out ſuch Arguments in oppoſition to theſe myſterious Truths, which mere natural Reaſon, without ſome higher Light, doth ſcarce know how to anſwer.

Were it my preſent Buſineſs to prove the *Being* and *Attributes* of God, it were eaſie to produce Arguments from a great variety of Topicks; as from the Creation of the World, from the Uſefulneſs, Beauty, and Order of the Univerſe;

verſe; from the regular Motions of the Sun, Moon, and Stars; from the conſtant Succeſſion of Night and Day, Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter; from the univerſal Conſent of Nations; from the Faculties of the Rational Soul; from the ſecret Operations of Conſcience, and from the Fears and Hopes of dying Men. And ſince God is *Ens neceſſarium*, a neceſſary Being, *Primus motor*, the firſt Mover, and original Cauſe of all created Beings, we may thence by Diſcourſe, and the ſtrength of natural Reaſon infer his Unity.

But when we are to prove a *Trinity* of *Perſons* in the *Godhead*, there is but one way to do it, and that is by *Divine Revelation*, by the Teſtimony of that God, who alone doth perfectly know his own Being, whatſoever is in it, and belongs unto it. True it is, this Doctrine of a *Trinity* in *Unity* being firſt revealed in the Scriptures,

tures, ſome things in *Nature* have been thought to be weak *Emblems*, and imperfect Reſemblances of it. As for inſtance; there is in the Sun, Light, Heat, and Influence; Three diſtinct things, and yet but One Sun; there is in the Soul of Man an Underſtanding, a Will, and a Memory; the Soul of Man hath a Power of Reaſon, Senſe, and Vegetation, Three diſtinct Faculties, and yet the Soul is but One. But, alas! theſe *Similitudes* are not *Arguments*; they are not uſed as *Grounds* of our *Faith*, but only as *Illuſtrations* to facilitate our Belief, and render it ſomewhat the eaſier. There is nothing found in nature that can demonſtrate the *certainty* of a *Trinity* in *Unity*; but theſe faint Reſemblances are made uſe of to aſſiſt our Reaſon, and help our Conceptions in apprehending its *Poſſibility*.

Now

Now that this Doctrine of the *Trinity* of Perſons in the *Unity* of the Godhead, is not only *poſſible*, but certainly *true*, I ſhall endeavour to evince againſt our Modern *Socinians*, who are the unhappy Spawn of the ancient *Ebionites*, *Sabellians*, and *Arians*, by the Teſtimony of God, recorded in the Holy Scriptures, as they have been expounded by thoſe pious and learned Men, who are deſervedly eſteemed the moſt judicious *Criticks*, the ableſt *Interpreters*, and the choiceſt *Defenders* of the Catholick Faith.

To prove the certainty of this great Doctrine I ſhall uſe Three ſorts of Texts. 1. Such Texts as in the Judgment of many learned Men, do import a *Plurality* of Perſons, or more diſtinct Subſiſtences than One in the Deity. 2. Such Texts as do reſtrain and limit this Plurality of Perſons to the number of *Three*, no more, no leſs. 3. Such Texts, as do prove

prove *each* of these *Three* distinct *Persons*, singly consider'd in his own *Hypostasis* or *Subsistence*, to be God; so called, not *Metaphorically*, as our *Socinians* would have it, but in the most *proper*, strict, and usual Sense of that Notion, as it imports a Being Eternal, Immense, Omnipotent, Omniscient, *&c.*

1. There are several Texts, some of which do very *probably*, and some very *certainly*, import a *Plurality* of Persons, or distinct Subsistences in the ever-blessed Godhead.

So do several judicious Men interpret the very first Verse of our Bible, as if it had been the Pleasure of Almighty God to give his Church a very early Intimation of this mysterious Doctrine, which was more clearly to be revealed in after-Ages. The Text runs thus: *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.* Gen. 1. 1. God, so we read it: But 'tis otherwise

therwiſe in the *Hebrew* ברא אלהים So ſaith the Original; which being exactly tranſlated, muſt be rendred thus: *The Gods created.* But are there more *Gods* than *One*, who had an hand in this great work of Creation? if not, Why is the only Creator here expreſſed by a Noun of the *Plural* number? *Pererius* anſwers, That this Expreſſion intimates, *Divinarum Perſonarum Multitudinem*; So he; and *Munſter* thus, *Inſinuatur ab exordio Scripturæ in Deo eſſe & Pluralitatem & Unitatem*: And ſo *Fagius*, who delivers it as the Opinion of many other Divines; for thus he tells us, *Noſtri hinc colligunt Trinitatis Myſterium, Trinitatem perſonarum è nomine Elohim, Unitatem Subſtantiæ ex adjuncto verbo ſingulari.* From this Text do our Divines collect the Myſtery of the *Trinity*, from the Noun *Plural* a *diſtinction* of Perſons, and from the Verb *ſingular* joined with it, the *Unity* of Eſſence.

From

From the ſame Text doth St. *Auguſtine*, that great Luminary of the Chriſtian Church, infer the Second Perſon in the Trinity: For his Words are theſe: *Perſonam filii evidenter oſtendit*; This Expreſſion doth evidently ſhew the Perſon of God the Son: For whereas 'tis ſaid, *In the beginning God created the Heaven and Earth*, this great Man doth thus demand, *Quem aliud Principium intelligendum putamus, niſi filium?* Whom elſe can we here underſtand by this Word *Beginning* but the Son? This Interpretation, which refers not to the *Time*, but to the *Author* of the Creation, is much countenanced by that which is given by the *Targum* of *Jeruſalem*, which tranſlates the firſt Words of the Verſe, not *In Principio*, In the *Beginning*, but *In ſapientia*, In, or by *Wiſdom*; and under that Notion many Chriſtian Writers have aſcribed it to our bleſſed Saviour, the Second Perſon in the Trinity;

being,

being, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, *The Wiſdom of God, by whom he made the World.*

Aug. de Gen. ad Lit. l. 1. cap. 6.

Accordingly St. *Auguſtine* elſewhere tells us: *In ipſo exordio inchoatæ Creaturæ Trinitas inſinuatur Creatoris.* In the very firſt mention of the Creation there is a fair Intimation of our Creator's Trinity; for when *Moſes* ſaith, *In the beginning God made Heaven and Earth: Intelligimus Patrem in Dei nomine, & in Principii nomine Filium.* By the Word *God*, we underſtand the *Father*; and by the Word *Beginning*, we underſtand the *Son*; and ſince the next Verſe mentions the Spirit of God, *Completam commemorationem Trinitatis agnoſcimus*; We own it as a compleat account of the Trinity: So thought this ancient and learned Father.

But there is another Verſe in the ſame Chapter, which is, and well may be urged to prove a *Plurality* of Perſons in the Deity; where

where *Moſes* brings in God Almighty ſpeaking thus, *Let us make Man.* Great St. *Baſil* here puts this Queſtion, Εἰπέ μοι μεμιγμένον ἐστὶ τὸ πρόσωπον; Is there but *One* ſingle Perſon here mentioned and concerned in the Creation of Man? Doubtleſs there muſt be *Two* at leaſt; the Perſon *ſpeaking*, and the Perſon or Perſons *ſpoke* unto. But the Queſtion is, ſaith *Athanaſius*, Τίνι ἔπτεν ὁ Θεὸς; To *whom* did God ſay, *Let us make Man?* To this Queſtion there are Four Anſwers given.

Gen. 1.26.

Baſil. M. in Hex. Hom. 9.

Athan. Dial. 3. de Trin. pag. (mihi) 224.

1. There is mention made by *Munſter* of one *Moſes Gerundenſis*, whoſe Opinion it was, that God Almighty ſpake theſe Words, *Let us make Man*, to the *Earth*; as if God and the Earth, as *Co-workers*, made Man betwixt them; the *Earth* his Body, and God his Soul.

St. *Paul* indeed rightly tells us, *The firſt Man is of the Earth,*

1 Cor. 15. 47.

Earthy, Γηγενὴς, made of the Earth. But though he was made of the Earth, yet he was not made by the Earth: For *Moſes* ſaith, *The Lord God formed Man of the Duſt of the Ground.* The Earth did indeed contain in it the Materials of *Adam*'s Body, but contributed nothing towards its *Frame*: There was not in the Earth any Active Principle that could enable it to tranſmute its own Duſt into Fleſh, Blood, Bones, *&c.* There was not in the Earth any ſuch δύναμις πλαστικὴ, ſuch a formative Vertue, as could any way tend towards the Compoſure of ſuch a curious and moſt admirable piece of Work, as the Body of Man moſt certainly is; For ſo intimates the Pſalmiſt, where he ſaith, *I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Acu pictus ſum*; My Body is ſo curiouſly wrought, as if it were embroidered by the Work of a Needle: And if ſo, could the dull Earth do this? it could no more *quicken* or *frame*

Pſ 139. 14.

Adam's

Adam's Body, than it can now *reſtore* or *revive* its dead.

No; in the Creation of *Adam*'s Body the Earth was wholy *Paſſive*, as indeed all other Matter is, of which any Artiſt makes ſuch or ſuch a Veſſel; the whole Work was God's, and done by his Almighty Power: For, if it were a Miracle in *Egypt* for Duſt to be turned into Lice, then certainly for Duſt to be turned into the Body of a Man, of an erect ſtature, conſiſting of various Members, artificially placed in a moſt excellent Order, can be no leſs.

Now, if it would be perfect Folly for any Workman to ſay to his Materials, *Let us make ſuch or ſuch a thing*, What reaſon hath any Man to think, that God ſhould ſay to the Earth, *Let us make Man?* 'Tis certain, that God Almighty could not want any aſſiſtance towards the Creation of Man; and 'tis as certain, that if he had needed any help, the Earth

could have yielded him none. So that this firſt Opinion deſerves rather to be *exploded* with *Contempt*, as being ridiculous, than to be *confuted* by *Arguments*, as if there were any ſhew of Reaſon and probability in it.

2. The Second Opinion about this matter is this; ſome have thought, that when God ſaid, *Let us make Man*, he ſpake of and to *Himſelf*, according to the preſent Cuſtom of the *Kings* and Princes of this World; who, to ſhew their Power, Majeſty, and Diſtinction from other Men, are commonly wont to ſpeak of themſelves, though but *ſingle* Perſons, in the *Plural* number.

But this Opinion is a meer Conjecture, for which there is no Ground; 'tis indeed a frivolous pretence firſt imagined by ſuch Perſons as were Enemies to the Divinity of Chriſt, and would fain exclude him from being concerned in this Text, and conſequently

quently from having any Hand in the Creation of Man. 'Tis indeed the uſual Style of *Earthly Kings* and Princes to ſpeak of themſelves in the *Plural* number; to ſay, *We*, *Us*, and *Our*: But this is not the uſual Style of *Almighty God*: For amongſt thoſe thouſands of Texts, wherein God ſpeaks of himſelf, there are but *Five* to be found, wherein he doth not ſpeak in the *Singular* number.

'Tis obſerved, that the Kings of this World, to ſhew their Sovereign Authority and Dominion over their Subjects, do ſpeak of themſelves in the Plural number at no time ſo much, as when they ſend forth their *Royal Edicts* and *Proclamations*; their common Style then runs thus, *We Command*; *'Tis Our Royal Will and Pleaſure.* And certainly if it had been the Pleaſure of God to diſplay his Glory, and to ſhew his abſolute and univerſal Dominion after the ſame manner, he would have

done it, when there was moſt occaſion for it; I mean, when he came to preſcribe and proclaim his *Royal Law*. But this he did not do; Exod.20.1 for *Moſes* tells us, *God ſpake theſe Words and ſaid*; but what did he ſay? And how did he ſtyle himſelf? Why thus, אנכי *I am the Lord?* 'Tis not *We*, in the *Plural*, but *I*, in the *ſingular* number. And ſince God, to ſhew his Majeſty, did not uſe this manner of Speech, when there was the greateſt Reaſon for it, we may eaſily think, that he did not uſe it to that end, when there was far leſs Reaſon, if any at all.

But methinks this fond Cavil ſhould not be ſo much as pretended to elude another Text, where God ſpeaks after the ſame manner; Gen.3.22. *Behold, the Man is become as one of Us*: Here again God was pleaſed to ſpeak of himſelf in the *Plural* number; but why ſo? 'tis very ſeldom that he doth it, and why then here? There was now no extraordinary

traordinary occaſion for him to ſhew the greatneſs of his Majeſty, like the Kings of this World, by a form of Speech, common indeed to them, but to him very unuſual. No, St. *Baſil* hath left us another, and a far better account of it than this; for thus he ſaith, Ὅτι μὴ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μόνου λέγει δῆλόν ἐστι. 'Tis evident, that God doth not here ſpeak of himſelf, as of *one* ſingle perſon only; but he ſpeaks of himſelf in the Plural number, for this Reaſon, Ἵνα συναριθμουμένους νοήσῃς, &c. That we might underſtand, that together with himſelf he reckon'd his Son and his Holy Spirit. Baſil. M. adverſus Eunom. l. 5. p. 132.

But there is yet another Branch of this Opinion, as if God ſpake theſe Words, *Let Us make Man*, not only *of* himſelf in the *Plural* number, with a deſign to diſplay his Glory, but *to* himſelf alone. With this Opinion, St. *Baſil* in his afore-named Book doth charge the *Jews*, who aſſer-

ted, Θεὸν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ διαλέγεσθαι. That God did here discourse in a Soliloquy with himself alone. This Opinion that learned Man deservedly thought to be very absurd, and such a Practice to be seldom or never seen; for thus he demands, Τὶς χαλκεὺς, ἢ τέκτων, ἢ σκυτοτόμος ἐπὶ τῶν Ὀργάνων τῆς τέχνης μόνος καθήμενος, ἐδένὸς αὐτῷ συνεργοῦντος, λέγει αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ποιήσωμεν τὴν μάχαιραν, &c. What Smith, what Carpenter, what Shoemaker, sitting alone amongst his Tools, and having no other Man to work with him, doth even speak to himself, and say, Let *us* make a *Sword*, a *Plow*, a *Shoe*? as that Father there goeth on. And if this Practice be a thing unusal, and would be thought but fooliſh amongst Men, we cannot without Blasphemy ascribe the same thing to God. But,

3. The Third Opinion about this Matter is this; namely, That when God said, *Let Us make Man*, he

he ſpake theſe Words to his *Angels*; as if thoſe bleſſed Spirits had an Hand in our Creation.

With this Opinion alſo doth great St. *Baſil* charge the *Jews*, who ſay, Πολλά ἐστι πρόσωπα πρὸς ἃ ὁ λόγος γέγονε τοῦ Θεοῦ. τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις λέγει τοῖς παρεσῶσιν αὐτῷ, God ſpake theſe Words to *many* Perſons, even the *Angels* that ſtood round about him. The ſame Opinion doth St. *Chryſoſtom* charge them with: Φασὶ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς Ἄγγελον, ἢ Ἀρχάγγελον; The *Jews* ſay, That God ſpake theſe Words to ſome of his *Angels*, or *Archangels*. And why they ſaid ſo, St. *Baſil* tells us, Τὸν μὲν ἀθετοῦντες ὑιὸν τοῦ δὲ συμβουλίας ἀξίωμα περιάπτουσι, καὶ τοὺς ὁμοδούλους ἡμῶν κυρίους ποιοῦσι τῆς ἡμετέρας δημιουργίας; The *Jews*, deſpiſing the Son of God, confer upon his Servants the Dignity of being his Fellow-Counſellors, and make our Fellow-Servants the Lords of our Creation.

Baſil. M. in Hex. Hom. 9.

Chryſoſtomus in Gen. 1.26.

Baſil. M. ubi ſuprá.

St.

St. *Basil* calls this Opinion, Ἰουδαϊκὸν πλάσμα, a *Jewish* Fiction, and St. *Chrysostom* in detestation of it, breaks out after his Rhetorical manner; ὦ τῆς ἀνοίας; ὦ τῆς πολλῆς ἀναισχυντίας; O the madness! O the great Impudence of these *Jews*! For when God said, *Let Us make Man after our own Image*, 'tis evident, that he spake to some Persons, whose Image was the self-same with his own; but that cannot be said of *Angels*. For, as St. *Basil* demands, Μὴ εἰκὼν μία Θεοῦ καὶ Ἀγγέλων; Is the Image of God and Angels One and the same? No, 'tis St. *Augustine*'s peremptory Assertion, *Nefas est credere ad Imaginem Angelorum hominem esse factum, aut eandem esse Imaginem Angelorum & Dei*; To believe that Man was made after the Image of Angels; or that the Image of God and Angels is the same, 'tis no less than sin.

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 16. cap. 6.

For

For the Scriptures do every where aſcribe the Creation of Man, not to *Angels*, but to *God* alone; and of him 'tis ſaid, *He* Created, not *They*, importing God and Angels; but in the ſingular number, *He*, importing none but God: 'Tis ſaid again, *God created Man*, not in *Their* Image, but *his own*.

Now, from the Authority of this and other Texts we may ſafely conclude, That this Speech of God, *Let Us make Man after our own Image*, could not be directed to *Angels*; the contrary Opinion being, as St. *Chryſoſtom* well ſtyles it, ληρωδία, the mere *dotage* of the blind and blockiſh *Jews*.

4. The fourth Opinion about this Matter is this, namely, That when God ſaid, *Let Us make Man*, he ſpake theſe Words to his only *Son*, and to his Holy *Spirit*.

This was the General Opinion of the ancient *Fathers*, and of the later

later and beſt Interpreters; ſo thought *Athanaſius*, εἶπε Θεὸς τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, God ſpake theſe Words to his *Son*; and ſo elſewhere, ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ἔλεγε τῷ υἱῷ Θεῷ, God the Father ſpake thus to God the Son. Of the ſame Judgment was *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, whoſe Obſervation is this; God did not ſay, *Let Us make Man*, Κατ' εἰκόνα ἐμὴν ἀλλὰ κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, Not according to *My* Image, but according to *Our* Image; and for that he gives this Reaſon, Συμπεριέλαβε γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν, ἵνα δειχθῇ ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὐ μόνου Θεοῦ πατρὸς ποίημα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντος, καὶ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, When God ſaid, *Let Us make Man*, and, according to *Our* Image, with himſelf he comprehended his *Son*, that it might be made evident, That the Creation of Man was the Workmanſhip, not only of God the *Father*, but alſo of our *Lord Jeſus* Chriſt, he alſo being the true God. To theſe Teſtimonies

Athan de Virgin. Tom. 3. p. 1043.

Athan. Dial. 3. de Trin. Tom. 2. pag. 224.

Cyril. Cat. 10. pag. 84.

nies we may add that of St. *Chryſoſtom*, who having put this queſtion, Τίς ὅτιν ἔτος; Who is this, to whom God ſaid, *Let Us make Man*? return'd this Anſwer, Τίς ἄλλος, ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἄγγελος, ὁ θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς; and at laſt, more plainly thus, ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς ἐστί, to whom elſe did God ſpeak theſe Words, but to him who is the Angel of his great Counſel, his wonderful Fellow-Counſellor, the Potentate, even the only begotten Son of God? And accordingly St. *Baſil* doth inſtance in the Creation of Man, as a proof of this Propoſition, Ἐνέργεια υἱοῦ καὶ πατρὸς μία, The Operation of the Son and of the Father is one and the ſame:

Chryſ. in Gen. Hom. 8.

Baſil. M. adverſùs Eunom. l. 4. p. 89.

But this Expreſſion, *Let Us make Man*, muſt not be ſo applied to God the *Son*, as to exclude God the *Holy Ghoſt*, nor did the ancient Fathers ever ſo intend it; for they take in the bleſſed *Spirit* too. So doth St *Baſil*, who puts the

the Question thus, Τίνι λέγει ὁ Θεὸς, ἢ τῷ λόγῳ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι; To whom did God say, *Let Us make Man*, save only to the *Word*, by whom all things were made, and to the *Spirit*? To the same purpose speaks *Athanasius*, ὁ κτίσας θεὸς μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου. God, together with his *Son* and his Holy *Spirit*, created Man. And so *Gregory Nyssen*, who tells us, that when *Moses* saith, *God made Man in his own Image*; Λέγει τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον; He means God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Athan. Dial. 3. de Trin. Tom. 2. p. 227.

St. *Auguſtine* in ſeveral places hath declared himſelf to be of the ſame Judgment; for, expounding theſe Words, *Let Us make Man*, he ſaith, *Recte illic intelligitur pluralitas Trinitatis*. And again he ſaith, that God ſpake of himſelf in the *Plural* number, *Ad inſinuandum ſcilicet Trinitatem Perſonarum*, To give us a fair Intimation

Aug de Civ. dei, l. 16. cap. 6.

Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 1. cap. 6.

on of the *Trinity*; for, ſaith he, ſince this Expreſſion runs in the *Plural* number; *Non recte diceretur, ſi homo ad unius perſonæ imaginem fieret*; This Expreſſion could not have been right, had Man been created after the Image of *One* Perſon only. Aug. de Trin. l. 12. cap. 6.

The Teſtimony of this Text I ſhall conclude with that Expreſſion of *Elias Cretenſis*, *Verba illa, faciamus hominem, filium cum Patre Creatorem eſſe oſtendunt*; Thoſe Words of God, *Let Us make Man*, do ſhew, that the *Son*, together with the *Father*, was Man's Creator. So that in the Judgment of theſe learned Men whom I have cited, this Text doth prove the thing for which I brought it, I mean a *Plurality* of Perſons in the ever-bleſſed Godhead. Elias Cretenſis in Nazian. or. 1. pag. 213.

But had theſe Authorities been inſufficient, I might have added more; and particularly that of *Tertullian*, who expreſly ſaith, That God Almighty was pleaſed in Tert. adverſus Praxeam. cap. 12.

in this Text, *Let Us make Man*, to ſpeak of himſelf in the *Plural* number; for this reaſon, *Quia jam adhærebat illi filius, ſecunda Perſona; & Tertia, Spiritus*; Becauſe his Son and his Spirit, a Second and a Third Perſon, were already, before the Creation of Man, cloſely united to him.

And now from theſe and the like Teſtimonies we may learn what was the Judgment of the ancient Fathers about the Senſe of this Text, *Let Us make Man*, and of the intention of God in it; they did not imagine, that God here, or any where elſe, ſpake of himſelf in the *Plural* number to ſhew his *Majeſty*, as the Kings of this World are now wont to do: Nor did they think that God ſpake theſe Words to *Himſelf* alone, as one *ſingle* Perſon, or to his *Angels*, who were then about him; theſe Opinions are only the Dreams of *Jews* and *Hereticks*, who are glad of any pretence to eſcape the force of all ſuch

ſuch Texts, which in oppoſition to their great Error, do evince and prove a *Plurality* of Glorious Perſons in the Godhead, of which number this Text is one, if we may rely upon the Judgment of thoſe ancient and very learned *Fathers*, who, writing with more Reaſon, and leſs Prejudice, are much more to be valued than *Jews* or *Socinians*.

And ſince our *Socinians*, to prove that God is but One, draw an Argument from the Firſt Commandment, which runs thus, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*; Or as it is in our Liturgy, *But me*. Since they from the Pronoun *Me*, being of the *Singular* number, infer the Unity of the *Godhead*; why might not the Fathers, as indeed they do, from the Pronoun *Us*, infer the Plurality of *Perſons*?

But becauſe *Jews* and *Socinians* are not ſatisfied with theſe or any other Texts out of the Old

Teſtament, which they interpret another, though far more improbable, way; the *Jews*, who quite caſhiere the whole New Teſtament, muſt be left under their preſent Judicial blindneſs; but for the conviction of ſuch as believe the Goſpel, and yet queſtion this great Doctrine of the Trinity, I ſhall thence produce a Text or two, which prove a *Plurality* of Perſons in the Deity, with as clear Evidence as any Words can give.

The Texts which I ſhall produce, were penned by St. *John*; to whoſe Goſpel I ſhall at preſent confine my ſelf; not for want of other Teſtimonies, but becauſe St. *John* wrote his Goſpel purpoſely to confirm the *Divinity* of Chriſt; and the occaſion of his doing ſo was this: In the time of his Baniſhment and Abſence from his Flock, certain peſtilent Hereſies were crept into the Church, and particularly that of *Cerinthus* and

and *Ebion*, a Man who asserted, That our Lord was conceived and born, as all other Men are; That he had a Man for his Father, as well as a Woman for his Mother; That before his Birth from *Joseph* and *Mary* he had no being, and consequently that he was not God.

Now, to stifle this damnable Heresie, like a deadly Cockatrice, in the Egg, and to prevent its future growth, St. *John*, as an ancient Author tells us, *Compulsus ab Episcopis Asiæ de Coæterna Patri Divinitate Christi scripsit adversus Hæreticos, qui Christum ante Mariam fuisse negabant.* St. *John* being importuned by the Bishops of *Asia*, wrote his Gospel against those Hereticks, who denied that Christ had any being, till he was born of *Mary*; and in this Gospel, to the confusion of those Hereticks, he hath delivered the Doctrine of Christ's *Divinity*, as being coeternal with God his Father.

Præfat. in ad Aug. expos. in Joannis Evangelium.

The like Story is recorded by *Euſebius*, though with ſome different Circumſtances; for, of St. *John* he ſpeaks thus, Συνιδὼν ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται προτραπεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων πνεύματι θεοφορηθεὶς, πνευματικὸν ἐποίησεν εὐαγγέλιον; St. *John* well knowing that the other Evangeliſts, who had wrote before him, had delivered the Hiſtory of Chriſt, eſpecially as it related to his Humane Nature, and the Actions done therein, being ſo exhorted by his Friends, and moved by the Spirit of God, wrote a Spiritual Goſpel; and that, as the ſame Hiſtorian ſaith elſewhere, τὴν θεολογίας ἀρξάμενος, beginning his Goſpel with the Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity. And why the delivering of this great Doctrine was by the bleſſed Spirit of God reſerved for St. *John*, and not committed to the other Evangeliſts, the Hiſtorian hath left us this Account; namely, That the clear

Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 6. cap. 14.

Euſeb Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. cap. 24.

Reve-

Revelation of our Lord's Divinity was left to St. *John*, εἰς κρείττονι, as to one that was better, as being what he is called, φίλος ἐπιστήθιος, Christ's *bosom* Friend, and more beloved than any of the other Apostles.

Now, since this beloved Disciple, by the Inspiration of God, wrote his Gospel on purpose to overthrow the Heresie of *Ebion* and his Followers, who asserted, That our blessed Redeemer was but a meer Man, and nothing more; we have all reason to conclude, that those usual Texts which are cited out of this Gospel as pregnant Proofs of our Lord's Divinity, were intended as such by the Holy *Spirit*, who *dictated*, and by the *Evangelist* himself, who wrote them.

The first of these Proofs is contained in the very first Verse of this Gospel, which runs thus; *In the beginning was the Word*, and *the Word was with God*, and *the* Joh. 1. 1.

Word was God; a Text ſo expreſs, that it cannot be fairly interpreted any other way, nor without much violence wreſted to any other Senſe, ſave only that wherein the Aſſertours of our Lord's *Divine Nature* do generally underſtand it.

Why our bleſſed Saviour is here called, ὁ λόγος, the *Word*, I am not now concerned to enquire: And that his Sacred Perſon is certainly meant by the *Word*, I need not ſtand to prove, becauſe I think that the *Socinians* themſelves do generally grant it. And indeed, conſidering the ſubſequent Verſes in the Context, they cannot without ſhame deny it, nor with any ſhew of Reaſon ſo much as doubt it.

Now, 'tis ſaid of this Word, ἦν, He *was*; 'tis not ſaid, He was *made*, or *created*, but He *was*, He had a Being, and that *In the beginning* ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*, not only the beginning of the *World* and *Time*; for our Lord

Lord was, as *Nonnus* ſtyles him, ἄχρονος, without and before all time, πρὸ πᾶν ποιημάτων, before all Creatures; as *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, cited by *Grotius*; who alſo ſaith, *Mos eſt Hebræus*, &c. The *Hebrews* are wont by this Expreſſion to deſcribe *Eternity*. And ſo doth St. *Chryſoſtom* expound it, τοῦτο τὸ ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἶναι ἀϊδίως μόνον ἐστὶ δηλωτικόν; This Expreſſion, *The Word was*, ſheweth only his eternal Being. Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom. 3.

The Text goeth on, and tells us, *The Word was with God*, where by that known Rule, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ; we muſt underſtand that the *Word was with God in the beginning*, and ſince he was, 'tis well obſerved by *Clarius*, *Ecce Perſonarum diſtinctionem*: Here we may ſee the diſtinction of the Divine Perſons; for, as *Tertullian* rightly argueth, *Indubitanter alius oſtenditur, qui fuerit à Principio, alius apud quem fuit*; without all doubt, he that was with God, is thereby ſhewed to be Tert. adv. Prax. cap. 21.

one Perſon, and that God, with whom he was, is another; for 'tis not imaginable, that the Evangeliſt ſhould mean that One Perſon was with himſelf.

And as this Expreſſion, *The Word was with God*, doth neceſſarily imply a *diſtinction* of *Perſons*, ſo doth the next Clauſe as neceſſarily import an *Identity* of *Nature*; for 'tis expreſly ſaid, *The Word was God*; though a diſtinct Perſon, yet One and the ſame God. And this is yet farther evident from our Lord's own Mouth; for thus he
Joh. 10. 30. ſaith, *I and my Father are One.* Theſe Words, *I and my Father*, do undeniably prove the *diſtinction* of their *Perſons*; and whereas he ſaith, *I and my Father are One*, that clearly ſheweth the *Unity* of their *Eſſence.* 'Tis not ſaid in the Maſculine Gender, *I and my Father are* εἷς, One Perſon; but in the Neuter, ἕν, I and my Father are One *thing*; and if that thing be not the *Divine Being*, they cannot be

be *One*. For, ſince the *Father* is confeſſed to be *God*, the *Son* cannot be *One* thing with him, unleſs he be *God* too.

And in this Senſe, according to the genuine Conſtruction of the Words did our Saviour's Hearers rightly underſtand this Speech of his; for when our Lord had ſaid, *I and my Father are One*; the Evangeliſt tells us in the very next Verſe, *Then the Jews took up Stones again to ſtone him*, and gave this Reaſon for it; *We ſtone thee for Blaſphemy, becauſe thou, being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God.* The *Jews* took his meaning right, and were ſatisfied, that when he ſaid, *I and my Father are One*, he made himſelf *God*; and indeed ſo he was, and his Words do ſo clearly import it, that if he had not been God, for this Speech of his he had deſerved to die.

I know that our *Socinians*, to elude the force of theſe Words, which make ſo much againſt them, do find themſelves concerned to inter-

interpret them another way, as if their meaning were this, *I and my Father are One*; *i.* ſay they, there is, μία θέλησις, we are One in *Will* and *Affection*. And indeed ſo they are; 'tis a great Truth, but withal 'tis ſuch a Truth, as is not the proper import of this Text: For the Connexion of our Lord's Diſcourſe in the Context doth naturally lead us to another Interpretation; for, having ſaid, *No Man ſhall pluck my Sheep out of my Hand*: And again, *No Man is able to pluck them out of my Father's Hand*; he gave us an Intimation that his Sheep were equally ſafe in his *Father*'s Hand, and in his *own* too; and then immediately ſubjoyned this Reaſon for it, *I and my Father are One*; but in what Reſpects are they One? St. *Chryſoſtom* anſwers, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν; They are one in *Power*; and thence he draweth this inference, εἰ ἡ δύναμις ἡ αὐτὴ ἔυδηλον ὅτι καὶ ἡ ϑσία; If betwixt the Father and the Son there

Joh. 10. 28, 29.

Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom. 61.

there be an *Identity* of *Power*; 'tis very manifeſt, that there is an *Identity* of *Eſſence* too.

To the ſame purpoſe doth *Theophylact* expound this Text, *I and my Father are One*: But how are they One? He anſwers, κατὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ κράτος; They are one in *Nature*, *Eſſence*, and *Power*; and ſo concludes, That by theſe Words our Lord did make himſelf to be, ὁμοούσιον τῷ θεῷ, Conſubſtantial with God. Theophyl. in locum.

Gregory Nazianzen expounding this Text, *I and my Father are One*, refers the Word *One*, *Ad unitatem Divinitatis*, to the *Unity* of their *Deity*; and the Word *Are*, to the *Plurality* of their *Perſons*; and tells us, That our Lord ſpake theſe Words, *Ut duarum Perſonarum vocabula Unius Deitatis Majeſtatiſque demonſtraret*, that he might demonſtrate the Names of Two Perſons, his Father and himſelf, to be of *One Deity* and Majeſty. And ſo *Nicetas*, who ſaith, this Word, Greg Naz. Or. 49. pag. 728, 729.

Nicet. in Naz. Or. 24 pag. 881.

Word, *One*, *Eſſentiæ conjunctionem indicat*, declares the Conjunction or Unity of their Eſſence. And ſo doth *Gregory Nyſſen* thus conclude,

Greg. Nyſſen. contra Eunom. Or. 1. p. 7.

τὸ ἓν δὲ τὸ πατέρα σημαίνει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν υἱόν; This Word *One*, comprehends not the *Father* alone, but the *Son* too.

That Son, who is ſo cloſely united to the Father, that he elſewhere tells us, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; Of which Words St. *Chryſoſtom* hath left us this Paraphraſe;

Joh. 10. 38

Chryſoſt. in Joan. Hom. 61.

Οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐγὼ ἢ ὅπερ ὁ πατὴρ, μένων υἱός, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐκεῖνος ἢ ὅπερ ἐγὼ μένων, πατήρ; I am nothing elſe but what the Father is, yet continuing the Son; the Father is nothing elſe, but what I am, yet continuing the Father: Which Expreſſion doth clearly import, That there is no difference betwixt the Father and the Son in reſpect of Nature and Eſſence; and yet that there is a Perſonal Diſtinction between them, ariſing from, and founded upon

upon their mutual Relations of Paternity and Filiation; the ſame Nature being ſtill equally common to both.

So common, that St. *Baſil* tells us, πατέρα καλεῖς, τὴν πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν κηρύττεις ταυτότητα; When you name the *Father*, you proclaim an *Identity* with the *Son*; and for that Reaſon he hath left us this Counſel, Μὴ διέλῃς τὸ ἓν; Divide not that which is but One. This Counſel our *Socinians* will not follow; for, ſo far as they can, they divide the θεάνθρωπος, and part the *God* and the *Man*. Theſe Men are of the ſame Stamp with thoſe Hereticks of whom the ſame St. *Baſil* doth elſewhere thus complain, ὁρῶσιν ἐγγεγραμμένον, &c. They ſee 'tis written, *I and my Father are One*; and what then? He ſaith, Μισοῦσι τὴν λέξιν ὡς ἀληθείας μητέρα; They hate this Speech, as being the Mother of Truth; ſuch a Truth, as being entertained, would infallibly ſtifle thoſe Errors, which

Baſil. Sel. Orat. 24. pag. 132.

Baſil. Sel. Or. 32. pag. 171.

which are the unhappy Brats of their own corrupted Brains. But though our *Socinians* would fain elude this Text, as their Sire *Arius* endeavoured, but in vain, in the firſt *Nicene* Council, who being asked by *Athanaſius*, what our Lord meant, when he ſaid, *I and my Father are One*, anſwered thus, They are *One*; *i.* εἴπε περὶ συμφωνίας; he meant, *One* in *Mind* and agreement of *Will* and Operation, as if that were all which this Text imports.

Athan. Diſput. contra Arium, p. 116.

And yet this, μία θέλησις, and this, μία ἐνέργεια, this *Oneneſs* of *Will* and Operation, doth ſuppoſe and prove an *Oneneſs* of *Nature* too; ſo thought St. *Baſil*, who expreſly ſaith, εἰ ἓν κατ' ἐνέργειαν λέγουσιν ἀναγκη καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν λέγειν τυτέστιν ὁμοούσιον πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν; If they, *i.* the *Arians* and *Eunomians* ſay, That the Father and the Son are one in *Operation*, they muſt needs grant, that they are One in *Eſſence* too; *i.* That the Father and

and the Son are Conſubſtantial. Accordingly St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* explaining theſe Words, *I and my Father are One*, tells us, That they are One in ſeveral reſpects; and the very firſt which he names is this, διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα ἀξίωμα ἐπειδὴν θεὸς θεὸν ἐγέννησε; They are One as to the *Dignity* of their *Deity*, inaſmuch as God begat a God. Cyril. Hieroſ. in Catech. 11. p. 99.

Athanaſius likewiſe tells us, That our Lord ſpake theſe Words, *I and my Father are One*, γινώσκων ἑαυτὸν μὴ διεζῶτα ἀπὸ τῆς πατρὸς κατ' οὐσίαν, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον τῇ θεότητι τῷ θεῷ πατρί; knowing that he did not differ from his Father in point of Subſtance, but was united to him in the Godhead. Athan. Diſput. contra Arium, p. 132.

The *Latin* Fathers are of the ſame Judgment: Accordingly St. *Ambroſe* ſaith of our Lord and his Father, *Etſi Perſonis duo, Poteſtate unum ſunt*, Though they are Two in reſpect of their Perſons, yet they are but One in reſpect of their Ambroſ. in Luc. l. 2. c. 2.

Auguſt in Joan. Tract 36. p. 61.

their Power. St. *Auguſtine* alſo, who was Contemporary to St. *Ambroſe*, and in ſome degree his Convert, doth from theſe Words, *I and my Father are One*, collect the *Diſtinction* of their *Perſons*, and the *Unity* of their *Godhead*, and doth urge this Text as an Argument both againſt the Hereſie of *Arius* and *Sabellius*; for thus he writes, *Quòd dixit, Unum, liberat te ab Ario*; *quòd dixit, ſumus, liberat te à Sabellio*: Whereas our Lord mentioned himſelf and his Father as *One*; this Word *One* is enough to preſerve or free us from the Hereſie of *Arius*: And whereas our Lord ſaid of himſelf and his Father, *We Are*, this Word *Are*, is enough to preſerve or free us from the Hereſie of *Sabellius*: For thus he goeth on, and argueth, *Si unum, ergo non diverſum*; *ſi ſumus, ergo & Pater & Filius*; *ſumus enim non diceret de uno, ſed & unum non diceret de diverſis*; ſince our Lord ſtyled himſelf and his Father *One Thing*,

thing, 'tis evident, that they are not *diverſe* things; for had they been ſo, he would not have called them *One*: And ſince our Lord ſaid, *We are*, 'tis evident, that there is both *Father* and *Son*; for our Lord would not have ſaid, *We are* of *One*. 'Tis plain from this Diſcourſe of his, that this great Man, St. *Auguſtine*, did infer from theſe Words the *Divinity* of Chriſt, which was denied by *Arius*; and the reality of *diſtinct* Perſons in the *Deity*, which was denied by *Sabellius*, who thought them to be mere *Denominations* of *One* and the ſame Perſon only.

This one Text, *I and my Father are One*, being thought by the ancient Fathers a full proof of that for which I urged it; namely, the *Divinity* of Chriſt, and conſequently a *Plurality* of Perſons in the Deity, I need not add any more particular Authorities to confirm it. For, as *Maldonate* obſerves, *Catholici omnes dicunt eſſentiam ſignificare*: Maldonatus in loc.

nificare: All Catholick Writers expounding theſe Words, *I and my Father are One*, do agree with one conſent, that our Lord did mean *One Eſſence*, One Nature, One and the ſame God.

Wherefore forbearing the preſent mention of any more either Sacred Texts or Humane Authorities, I ſhall conclude this Head of Diſcourſe, with the Saying of that ancient Author, whoſoever he were, who doth bear the name of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and tells us, τὰ θεῖα ἥνωται καὶ διακέκριται· ὅπως δὲ ταῦτά ἐςιν, ὅτε εἰπεῖν, ὅτε ἐννοῆσαι δυνατὸν; There is in the Godhead an *Unity*, and yet a *Diſtinction*; an *Unity* of *Nature*, and yet a *Diſtinction* of *Perſons*; but how it comes to be ſo, 'tis not poſſible either to ſay, or comprehend.

Dion. Areop. de Div. nom. pag. 173, 174.

2. And now having, I think, ſufficiently prov'd a *Plurality* of Perſons in the Deity by ſeveral Texts according to that Senſe, wherein the ancient *Fathers* did, and

and the generality of later Interpreters ſtill do, with great reaſon, underſtand them; my next work muſt be to conſider thoſe Texts, which determine and reſtrain this *Plurality* of Perſons to the number of *Three*, no more, no leſs. In this caſe, *Tria ſunt Omnia*, Three are All.

We read what a great reſpect *Pythagoras* and his Sect had for their τετρακτύς, their *Quaternary number*; ſuch an eſteem had they for it, that Ναὶ μὰ τὴν ἀμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτύν, was with them a *Religious Oath*. And as for the *Septenary* Number *Gregory Nazianzen* ſtyles it, Ἀριθμῶν μυστικώτατος καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ σύστοιχος, of all numbers the moſt *myſtical*, and even Contemporary with the World. And yet the *Ternary* number was long before it: And as it is the moſt *ancient*, ſo is it the moſt *perfect*, not only, *Quia habet Principium, medium & finem*, which is the Reaſon commonly given; but *Quia Divinitas in Trinitate*

Greg. Naz. orat. 42. p. 687.

Corn. à lap. ex Damaſc. in l. 5 c. 6. v. 3.

nitate eſt : It is the number of the glorious Perſons in the Godhead.

And although this number of the Divine Perſons was not of old ſo clearly revealed to the *Jewiſh* Church, as now it is to the *Chriſtian*; yet the *Jews* were not altogether left without ſome Intimations of it. *Gregory Nyſſen* mentions ſeveral Texts out of the Old Teſtament, and ſaith, That by them, *Perſpicuè & clarè Sancta Trinitas, Patris inquam, & Filii, & Sancti Spiritus, demonſtrari atq; probari poteſt*, The Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit may be demonſtrated, and very clearly proved.

Greg. Nyſ. de Trin. adv. Judæos, p. 993.

But yet we have reaſon to believe that theſe Texts of the Old Teſtament, which are now urged as Arguments to prove the *Trinity*, were not underſtood, at leaſt not ſo well, by the ancient *Jews*, as now they are by us. 'Tis uſually ſaid, *Teſtamentum Novum velatum*

latum eſt in Veteri, vetus revelatum in novo: The *New Teſtament* was *couched* and veiled in the *Old*, and the *Old* is *revealed* and unfolded in the *New*; *Moſes* and the Prophets are in many things very much explained by our Lord's Evangeliſts and Apoſtles.

And a pregnant Inſtance of this we have in our preſent Caſe; whereas the Evangelical Prophet tells us, *I ſaw the Lord ſitting upon a Throne; above it ſtood the Seraphims, and cried one to another, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hoſts.* From this τρισάγιον, this threefold repetition of the Word *Holy*, do the ancient Fathers and Modern Divines infer the Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead, and that deſervedly too. Eſa. 6. 1.

This was the Opinion of *Athanaſius*, who writes thus; Ὅτε δοξολογῶσι τὰ χερουβὶμ τρίτον τὸ Θεὸν, λέγοντα, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, πατὴρ, καὶ υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα δοξολογῶσι; When the *Cherubims* glorifie God, Athanaſ. de hum. Chriſti Nat p. 601.

ſaying Three ſeveral times, *Holy, Holy, Holy*, they glorifie the *Father*, and the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. And to the ſame effect *Gregory Nazianzen* writes thus, τελεῖν ἁγιασμοῖς εἰς μίαν συνιᾶσι κυριότητα καὶ θεότητα δοξάζεσθαι, &c. God is glorified by theſe Three Acclamations of Holineſs meeting in one Lordſhip and Godhead. 'Tis that which *Oecumenius* delivers more plainly thus, τὸ τριυπόστατον τῷ τριπλασιασμῷ τῆς δόξης καὶ τῷ Ἁγιασμῷ ἔχομεν νοεῖν: By this *threefold Repetition* of Glory and Holineſs we have reaſon to underſtand, That there is a *threefold diſtinction* of ſubſiſtences in the Deity. But there is no Man who ſpeaks more poſitively about this matter than St. *Auguſtine* himſelf, who expreſly ſaith, *In eo quòd dicitur tertiò Sanctus Perſonarum Trinitatem; in eo verò quòd dicitur ſemel, Dominus Deus Sabaoth divinæ naturæ cognoſcimus unitatem*: Whereas the *Seraphims* cried *Holy* a *Third* time,

Greg. Naz. Or. 42. p. 679.

Oecum. in Apoc. c. 6. com. 8.

Aug. de fide ad Pet. Diac. tom. 3. p. 48.

time, we know thereby the *Trinity* of Perſons; and ſince they mentioned *the Lord God of Hoſts* but *once*, we know thereby the *Unity* of the Divine Nature.

Now the Queſtion is, What moved theſe and other learned Men thus to interpret this Prophetical Text, and to conclude from it the Doctrine of the *Trinity?* *Cornelius à Lapide* tells us, *Veteres Rabbini ſic exponunt*; the ancient *Jewiſh Rabbins* expound it thus; *Sanctus hic eſt Pater, Sanctus hic eſt Filius, Sanctus hic eſt Spiritus.* 'Tis here meant, That the Father is Holy, the Son is Holy, and the Spirit is Holy. But our Chriſtian Divines were not led to this Expoſition of the Text by the Example of any *Jewiſh* Doctors; for indeed they had a far better Authority for it; I mean, the Authorities of an *Evangeliſt* and an *Apoſtle*, St. *John*, and St. *Paul*.

Corn. à Lap. in locum.

When *Esaias* was writing this Text and the Context, he tells us, *I saw the Lord sitting upon a Throne.*
Joh. 12. 41 St. *John* referring to this Vision, saith, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him.* St. *Paul* also, referring to
Act 28. 25. the same Vision, saith, *Well spake the Holy Ghost by the Prophet Esaias.* Now, from these Texts compared together, great St. *Basil* doth, and well might, infer the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; for thus he tells us,
Basil. M. adversùs Eunom. l. 5. p. 115. προφήτης τοῦ πατρὸς εἰσηγεῖται πρόσωπον παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις πεπιστευμένου· ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς τοῦ υἱοῦ· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος τοῦ πνεύματος· ἕνα κυριον Σαβαὼθ τὴν ὀφθέντα κοινῶς ὀνομάζοντες; The *Prophet* introduceth the Person of the *Father*, on whom the *Jews* believed; the *Evangelist* referring to the same Scripture, doth undoubtedly mean the Person of the *Son*, and St. *Paul*, with the same Reference, mentions the Person of the *Holy Ghost*; each of which Persons is called by this one common Name,

Name, *the Lord of Hoſts*, and was ſeen by the Prophet in that Viſion of his.

Now, ſince this Prophetical Text hath been this way interpreted by ſome of the *Jewiſh Rabbins*, and certainly is ſo, and with better Reaſon, by many eminent *Writers* of the *Chriſtian Church*, who thought this Expoſition to be much countenanced, nay ſufficiently warranted by the Authority of St. *John*, and St. *Paul*; St. *John* ſaying, that the *Prophet ſpake when he ſaw his Glory, and ſpake of him*, undoubtedly meaning the Glory and Perſon of *Chriſt*; St. *Paul* alſo ſaying, *Well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by Eſaias*, meaning the Words relating to that particular Viſion: Since 'tis thus, we have reaſon to look upon this Text, which contains this *threefold* Acclamation of the Seraphims, *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hoſts*, to be a pregnant proof of the Holy and Bleſſed *Trinity*.

And

And yet becauſe this Prophetical Text hath been thought capable of another Interpretation; and becauſe *Calvin* himſelf, who was no *Socinian*, doth yet blame thoſe Divines, who plead this Text as an Argument to confirm this great Article of our Creed, as if we wanted fairer Proofs to do it. And becauſe this myſterious point of Faith is ſo very difficult to Humane Reaſon, that ſome deny it, and others doubt it; 'tis neceſſary that ſuch Evidences ſhould be produced for it, as may ſatisfie the Minds of impartial, unprejudiced, and reaſonable Men.

But to ſatisfie the Underſtandings of Men about this matter, no Arguments can be ſufficient, ſave only ſuch as are drawn from undoubted and clear Divine Revelation. And altho' it be a difficult Task to produce any fairer evidences to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, than thoſe already named out of the *Old Teſtament*; yet

yet we find good Store of them in the *New*. Our Lord himſelf by his Evangeliſts and Apoſtles hath furniſhed us with ſuch Proofs, as no Man, who dares not offer violence to ſuch and ſuch Texts, can ever gainſay. It's true, Men who make the Sacred Scriptures the *Subject* of their *Drollery* rather than the *Grounds* of their *Faith*, and the *Rules* of their *Manners*: Men of corrupted Brains and wanton Wits may, if they pleaſe, by unwarrantable Diſtinctions and falſe Interpretations, ſeemingly elude and enervate the force of the plaineſt Texts: But whoſoever is of a ſober, meek, and teachable Spirit, whoſoever is not unalterably wedded to his preſent Opinion, as Men are to their preſent Wives, whether good or bad, may find in the New Teſtament ſuch evident Proofs of the bleſſed *Trinity*, as are ſufficient to fix and ſettle his Judgment in the firm belief of this

this great and neceſſary Point of Faith.

And if we do indeed believe the whole Goſpel to be the infallible Word of that God who cannot lie, grant we muſt, That any one clear and undoubted Teſtimony of our Evangeliſts or Apoſtles were enough, though we had no more, to confirm any Article of our Creed, even ſuch as are the moſt difficult to Humane Reaſon; God's Αὐτὸς ἔφη, being enough to end all Controverſies, and to ſilence all Objections. And upon this Conſideration I do not think it neceſſary to name *abundance* of Texts, leſt by ſo doing I ſhould ſeem to diſtruſt the force of a *few*; and yet, though one ſingle Text might ſuffice, becauſe in other caſes two Witneſſes are commonly required, I ſhall make choice of two, and no more, becauſe the Evidence of each to me doth, and I hope to others will appear ſo plain, as to be ſufficient to do our Work.

The

The first Text, which I shall use to prove the Trinity of Glorious Persons in the Godhead, is that which contains the first Institution, and prescribes the solemn *Form* of *Baptism*, wherein our Lord gave his Apostles this Commission and Command, *Go ye and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Here is an express mention of *Three* distinct Persons, in whose name all Converts to the Christian Faith were to be baptized. Mat. 28. 19

'Tis the Observation of *Maldonate*, *Ex hoc loco rectè veteres Authores Trinitatis mysterium probaverunt*; By this Text did the ancient Authors prove the Mystery of the *Trinity*, and that very justly too. The Word *Name* in this place seems capable of two Interpretations, and no more: We may, as Expositors do, understand by it either, 1st. the *Command*, or 2dly, the *Worship* of God; and in both Senses Maldonatus in locum.

Senſes it will prove the Truth in hand. For if by this Word *Name*, our Lord means the *Warrant* and *Precept* of God, then the *Three* Perſons here mentioned, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, are repreſented to us as Perſons of equal *Power* and Authority. But if our Saviour's meaning be, as ſome render his Expreſſion more ſuitably to the Original, *Baptizing them*, εἰς ὄνομα, *Into the Name*, *i.* ſay our *Engliſh* Annotations, *Into the Profeſſion of the Service of One God in Three Perſons*; then the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, are here plainly recommended to us as equal *Objects* of Divine *Adoration*, and conſequently each perſon muſt be God.

Athan. in Epiſt. ad Serap. tom. 2. p. 14.

And accordingly *Athanaſius*, to prove the Deity of the *Holy Ghoſt*, makes uſe of this Text, and tells us, That when our Lord preſcribed this Form of Baptiſm, Καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τούτοις ἐθεμελίωσε καὶ ἐρρίζωσε, he did found and root the

the Catholick Church in the *Trinity*; and then to prove that the *Holy Spirit* is God, he adds, κτίσμα δὲ εἰ ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐκ ἂν συνέταξεν αὐτὸ τῷ πατρὶ, ἵνα μὴ ἡ ἀνόμοιον ἑαυτῇ ἑτερὰς ξένης τίνος καὶ ἀλλοτρίας συνταττομένης αὐτῇ, *i.* If the *Spirit* had been a *Creature*, our Lord would never have placed him in the ſame *Rank* with the *Father*, leſt a Perſon of another Nature being added to it, and joined with it the Trinity ſhould be unlike to its ſelf.

Gregory Nazianzene ſirnamed ὁ Θεολόγος, the eminent Divine, ſtyles Baptiſm, Ἄρνησις ἀθεΐας, καὶ ὁμολογία θεότητος, The *Abrenunciation* of *Atheiſm*, and the *Confeſſion* of the *Deity*, and the *Deity* ſubſiſting in *Three* diſtinct Perſons: For the Profeſſion of the Trinity was, διδαχὴ τοῦ βαπτισμάτων, One of the main things required in order to Baptiſm. So doth this great Man intimate, Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸ πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὁμοβοσίαν τε καὶ ὁμόδοξα, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα

Greg. Naz. Or. 32. p. 52.

μα τελείωσιν ἔχει, καὶ ὅτω καταρτιζόμεθα, τὸ μὲν ἓν γινώσκοντες τῇ θεότητι καὶ τῷ ἀμερίστῳ τῆς προσκυνήσεως· τὰ δὲ τρία, ταῖς ὑποστάσεσι, *i.* We believe in the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, being of one and the ſame Subſtance and Glory, in whom alſo Baptiſm hath its Perfection; and believing thus we are made perfect, *i.* Baptized, knowing that God is *One* in *Subſtance*, and *undivided* in *Worſhip*, yet *Three* in point of *Subſiſtence*; according to that of *Syneſius*, who makes this addreſs to God, Μονὰς εἶ, τριὰς ὢν, Thou being a *Trinity*, art an *Unity* too; Three in One reſpect, and One in another, and that is no Contradiction.

Syneſ. Hymno 4.

And that the *Three* Perſons mention'd in this Form of Baptiſm are *One* and the ſame God, conſtituting a Glorious *Trinity*, is yet further evident from thoſe Reaſons, which *Gregory Nyſſen* hath left us, why our Lord was pleaſed to preſcribe the form of Baptiſm in this

Greg. Nyſ. in Baptiſ. Chriſti, p. 804.

this manner, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*: But why in the Name of the Father? So *Nyſſen* demands, and anſwers thus, ἐπειδὴν ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων, becauſe the Father is the Original of all things and Perſons: But why in the Name of the Son? he gives this Reaſon, ἐπειδὴν δημιουργὸς ϗ κτίσεως, becauſe he was the Worker and Author of the Creation: And why in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt? his Account is this, ἐπειδὴν τελειωτικὸν τῆς πάντων, becauſe it is he that doth finiſh and perfect all things; each of which Works doth ſpeak each Perſon to be no leſs than God.

And from this Form of Baptiſm doth *Theophylact* take a juſt occaſion to condemn the Hereſies both of *Arius* and *Sabellius*, the one denying the *Divinity*, the other the *Perſonalities* of the *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*. For whereas our Lord here mentions not *Names*, Theophyl. in locum.

but *Name* in the *Singular* number; thence he concludes against *Arius*, ὄνομα τῶν τριῶν ἐν, ἡ θεότης· εἷς ἐν θεὸς τὰ τρία, The Name of the *Three* is but *One*, and that *One* is the Deity; and therefore these *Three* are *One* God. And whereas *Sabellius* affirmed, That there is but *One* single Person in the Godhead, our Lord here doth expressly mention *Three*.

But not to mention the Opinions of any more *particular Persons* touching the Interpretation of this Text; methinks the *whole Catholick Church* hath declared her Judgment about it, by her known Practice in the constant administration of Baptism, whereby she hath discovered her Belief, That this Form of Baptism prescribed by our Lord, doth contain and prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. That Practice of the Ancient Church, which I mean, was their *Trina Immersio*, their Custom of dipping every baptized Person, except

except the *Clinici*, or Bed-rid, in or under the Water Three times over. This Practice was thought by ſome to be of Apoſtolical Inſtitution, becauſe St. *Paul* mentions the Doctrine, τῶν βαπτισμάτων, of *Baptiſms* in the *Plural* number, though no Perſon ought to be baptized more than once. But whether this Practice were derived from the Apoſtles or not, it was uſed very early in the Primitive Church; ſo it was in *Tertullian*'s time, who mentions it as their common Cuſtom, *Ter mergitamur*, We are dipped three times; ſo he.

Heb. 6. 2.

Tert. adv. Prax. cap. 27. p. 516.

Nay, this threefold Dipping was required with the greateſt ſeverity by the Apoſtle's Canons; one of which runs thus; εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἓν βάπτισμα, &c. If any Biſhop or Presbyter in the adminiſtration of any one Baptiſm ſhall not uſe *Three* Dippings. What

Apoſt. Canon. 50.

then? Καθαιρείσθω, ſaith the *Canon*, *i.* let him be depoſed. And for this Cuſtom I find Two Reaſons given; One by *Athanaſius*, namely this, τὸ καταδύσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τρίτον, καὶ ἀναδύσαι, τοῦτο δηλοῖ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸ τριήμερον ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the dipping of the Child in the Font Three times, and his riſing again out of the Water, repreſents the *death* of Chriſt, and his lying in the Grave *Three* days, and his Reſurrection upon the *Third*; and that's one Reaſon why this treble Immerſion was uſed.

Athan. quæſt. de Parab. Ev. 94. T. 2. p. 345.

But there is another Reaſon given us, which is to my preſent purpoſe; *Zonaras*, expounding that *Canon* of the Apoſtles which relates to this matter, tells us, Διορίζεται διὰ τριῶν καταδύσεων τὸν μύησιν ὑπιτελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὸν βαπτίζοντα ἑκάστην τῶν καταδύσεων ἐν τῇ ἁγίας τριάδος ὀνομα λέγειν ἔνομα, *i.* The *Canon* determines, That Baptiſm ſhall be adminiſtred

Zon. in Apoſt. Can. 5

miniſtred by three dippings; and that he who doth baptize, ſhould at every dipping pronounce the Name of *One* of the Perſons in the Glorious *Trinity*. A like account we have from *Tertullian* too, who ſaith, *Ad ſingula nomina in ſingulas perſonas mergitamur*, We are dipped and baptized into the ſeveral Perſons of the Trinity at the pronunciation of their ſeveral Names. And to this threefold Dipping great St. *Baſil* ſeems to add a threefold Supplication, to each Perſon of the Trinity One; for thus he writes, ἐν τρισὶ καταδύσεσι καὶ ἰσαριίθμαις ἐπικλήσεσι μὶγα μυςήριον τοῦ βαπτίσματος τελειοῦται, The great Myſtery of Baptiſm is perfectly performed by *Three Immerſions*, and an equal number of *Invocations*: By which he probably means *one* Prayer to the *Father*, a *Second* to the *Son*, and a *Third* to the *Holy Ghoſt*, begging their joynt Bleſſings upon their own joynt Inſtitution.

Tert. ubi ſuprâ.

Baſil. M. de Sp. S.

Now then, ſince in this preſcribed Form of Baptiſm, the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt* are plainly repreſented as *Three Perſons* of equal capacity to *inſtitute* this Sacrament, and to be *worſhipped* by it; ſince it is not reaſonable to imagine, that our Lord would here have joyned himſelf and his Spirit to his Father, as Perſons co-ordinate with him, had they not indeed been his Equals. And ſince it hath been the practice of the Catholick Church in the adminiſtration of this Sacrament, to name and invoke each of theſe ſacred Perſons; we have all reaſon to conclude, that this Form of Baptiſm, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, doth indeed contain and prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, the *Diſtinction* of *Perſons*, and *Unity* of *Eſſence*.

And the truth is, were the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, in whoſe Name we are baptized, no more than Crea-

Creatures, our Lord's Form of Baptiſm would not be of much better account than that of *Marcion*; who baptized, εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνωςῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς ἀλήθειαν μητέρα τῶν πάντων, εἰς τὸν καταβάντα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, *i.* In the Name of the unknown Father of the Univerſe, of the Verity, the Mother of all things, and of him who deſcended upon Jeſus. For if to be baptized into the Worſhip of Creatures, be to be baptized into downright and groſs Idolatry, whether the Inſtitution were from *Chriſt* or *Marcion*, it would make no difference. Nor do I ſee how thoſe Perſons who will not allow this Form of Baptiſm to be a proof of the *Trinity*, can diſcharge themſelves from Blaſphemy againſt our bleſſed Saviour, not only by *denying* his *Divinity*, but alſo by charging him with the Inſtitution of a new Sacrament in the name and for the Worſhip of Creatures: for ſuch it is, if their Sup-

poſition be true. But if this Text, with ſome Men, will not do our Buſineſs, let us yet try another.

2. The ſecond and only Text, which I ſhall yet uſe to prove the *Trinity* of Perſons in the *Unity* of the Godhead, is that known place
1 Joh. 5. 7. of St. *John*, where he ſaith, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven:* What *Three*? not *Three Angels*, for of them there are *Millions*; not *Three* meer *Denominations*, but Three *Perſons*, the *Father*, the *Word*, *i.e.* the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, and of them the Text ſaith, *Theſe Three are One*; One in the ſame Senſe wherein our Lord had ſaid, *I and my Father are One*, ἓν, One *Thing*, One *Being*, and that muſt be the Being of God. For ſince the Father is confeſſed to be God, the Son cannot be One thing with him unleſs he be God too.

The

The force of this Text is so unavoidable, that our *Socinians*, not knowing how to elude it, do find themselves constrained to deny its *Authority*, and to pretend that it is indeed no part of the *Canon*; to which I answer,

1. In General, that it hath been the common Course of *Hereticks* to disown the *Authority* either of such whole *Books*, or such particular *Texts*, as did gall and pinch them, and overthrow those erroneous Opinions, which they had entertained, and were resolved to maintain either through Prejudice or Ignorance, or Shame, to recant. Of such Men *Irenæus* thus observes, *Cùm ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neq; sint ex Authoritate*; when they are confuted by such and such Texts, they blame the Scriptures, as if they were not right nor Authentick. Upon this Score, the *Jews*, being obstinate

Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 3 c. 2.

in

in their Infidelity, deny the *Authority* of the whole *New Teſtament*, becauſe it being compared with *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, it doth ſo evidently prove our *Chriſt*, whom they diſown, to be the promiſed *Meſſias*. Upon a like account did the *Ebionites* reject all our Goſpels, except that of St. *Matthew* only. And *Irenæus* ſaith again of *Marcion*, *Evangelium ſecundùm Lucam circumcidit, & Apoſtoli Pauli Epiſtolas abſcidit*; He circumciſed St. *Luke*'s *Goſpel*, and quite cut off St. *Paul*'s *Epiſtles*, *i.* from the *Canon*. And truly ſince our *Socinians* are not aſhamed in favour of their own ill Opinion to *corrupt*, invert, and wreſt the plain and obvious Senſe and Meaning of St. *John* in the beginning of his *Goſpel*, we need not wonder, that for the ſame Reaſon, they ſhould endeavour to *obliterate*, expunge, and blot out a Paſſage of his *Epiſtle* too. But,

Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 29.

2. We

2. We anſwer more particularly thus; namely, That the Pretence which our *Socinians* plead againſt the Authority of this Text, is very weak and inſufficient; for 'tis only this; they tell us, That in ſeveral Manuſcripts and printed Copies this Text is not found; to which we thus reply:

1. By way of Conceſſion; we confeſs with *Calvin*, *Totum hoc à quibuſdam omiſſum fuit*; this whole Verſe by ſome hath been omitted. And we believe what *Eraſmus* tells us, That in one *Greek* Copy he found no more than this, ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα; That there are *Three* that bear Record, the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*; to which St. *Cyril* adds, as *Eraſmus* cites him, *Hi tres unum ſunt*; Theſe *Three* are *One*. The Truth of this we grant. But,

2. We

2. We anſwer, That the Copies, wherein this Text is found, as now it ſtands, are more in number, and of *greater Credit*, if we may believe Tradition, than thoſe Copies wherein this Text is either *omitted* or altered.

Eſtius, a learned Interpreter of St. *John*'s Epiſtle, tells us, and cites an Author for it, That of *Sixteen* ancient *Greek* Copies, which were brought together from *Italy*, *France*, and *Spain*, *Seven* wanted this Text, and *Nine* had it. But becauſe the diſparity betwixt *Seven* and *Nine* is not ſo very conſiderable, he farther tells us, That of a *great number* of Manuſcript Copies that were gathered together by the Divines of *Lovain*, there were but *Five* wherein this Text was wanting. And an eminent Divine of our own Church, ὁ μακαρίτης, now with God, being famous as well for his great Piety as for the depth of his Learning, hath left us this Teſtimony; namely, that this diſputed Text,

as

as it is now read in our Bibles, hath the Authority of *many* ancient, and *All* printed Copies but *One*.

Now, if from theſe Inſtances we may take an Eſtimate of the difference betwixt thoſe Copies, which have this Text, and thoſe which want it in point of *number*; the *Majority* of Voices will certainly be on our ſide, and that doth always carry the Cauſe, at leaſt where the moſt Teſtimonies are of *equal*, but much more where they are of greater *Credit* than the *feweſt*; and that is the preſent Caſe.

For according to the old Rule, *Quod Antiquiſſimum, Veriſſimum*: Thoſe Copies which are moſt ancient, are ſuppoſed to be of the greateſt Credit; and thoſe *Fathers* who lived neareſt to the Apoſtles times, as they are the more *venerable* for their *Antiquity*, ſo are they the leſs *liable* to any *ſuſpicion* of *Partiality* in their Writings,

tings, much leſs of *Fraud* and Forgery, and that in a Caſe which needed none.

Now if our *Socinians* ſhall object, that St. *Auſtin* doth not mention this Text, when he diſputes againſt the *Arians*; we anſwer, 'Tis very poſſible that St. *Auſtin* might have a *corrupt* Copy before him; or if not ſo, yet having ſufficiently proved his Doctrine by other Texts, he might ſee no *need* of this: but however, tho' St. *Auſtin* uſe it not, yet his Contemporary, St. *Hierom*, owns it, and blames thoſe as Infidels who left it out. And ſurely St. *Hierom*, ſince he wrote a Book, *De Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, was well acquainted with the Writings of that and former Ages.

But if St. *Hierom* alone be not of gravity enough to be put in the Scales with, and to counterbalance that great Man St. *Auſtin*, to help to make up weight we ſhall add to him the Teſtimony of

of St. *Cyprian*, who writes thus, *Scriptum eſt de Patre, & filio, & Spiritu Sancto : Et hi tres unum ſunt :* It is written of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit : *And theſe Three are One.* But where is it ſo written? certainly in this diſputed Text, or no where. Now to make over-weight, and turn the Scales, we ſhall put in ſome Ounces more, I mean the Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, that very early Author, whom *Euſebius* ſtyles Ἀνὴρ ἔνδοξος καὶ τὰ πρὸς μάλιστα ὅτι ῥώμης λαμπρῶν, a famous Man; and of the *Roman* Writers the moſt celebrated; this *Tertullian* having mentioned the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, immediately ſubjoyns, *Qui tres unum ſunt*, which *Three* are *One*; and he thus expounds it, *non unus*, They are not *One Perſon*; but *Unum*, One *Thing* : The Word, ſaith he, referring, *Ad ſubſtantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri ſingularitatem*, To the *Unity* of their *Subſtance*, not to the *Singularity* of *number*.

Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ. p. 181.

Euſeb. Hiſt Eccleſ. l 2. cap. 2.

Tert. adv. Praxeam, c. 25. p. 515

number. And from theſe inſtances 'tis evident, that although St. *Auſtin* doth no where mention this diſputed Text. Yet St. *Hierom*, who lived in the ſame Age; and St. *Cyprian*, and *Tertullian*, who lived long before St. *Auſtin*'s time, do; which ſheweth, that in thoſe early Days it was took for a part of the *Canon*; and if ſo, why ſhould it not be thought ſo ſtill?

But further yet, if as to ſome *Greek* Writers, our *Socinians* ſhall object, That *Oecumenius*, who expounds this Epiſtle of St. *John*, takes no notice of this diſputed Verſe; we thus reply; namely, That *Athanaſius*, who was at leaſt as great a *Divine*, and certainly of greater *Antiquity*, not only hath it, but uſeth it as a convincing *Argument* in his Diſputation againſt *Arius*; for thus he tells him, Ἰωάννης φάσκει, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἕν εἰσι, St. *John* ſaith, *And theſe Three are One*; he doth not only name the *Words*, but their

Athan. Cont. Arium Diſp. p. 147.

Writer

Writer too, and peremptorily aſcribes them to St. *John*. And had they not then been generally received as St. *John*'s indeed, we cannot imagine but *Arius* then, as our *Socinians* now do, would have denied the *Authority* of that Text which made ſo much againſt him, had it been in thoſe Days thought liable to the ſuſpicion of being ſuppoſititious.

And ſince this Text in thoſe early Days was received by the moſt eminent Divines of the Primitive Church as an undoubted part of the *Canon*; and by them urged againſt thoſe *Hereticks*, who denied the Doctrine therein contained; we have the ſame reaſon to own it as *Canonical* ſtill; for the omiſſion of it in ſome Copies, which comparatively are but few, and thoſe few far more liable to ſuſpicion than the Text it ſelf, cannot juſtly derogate any thing from its Authority: And the rather, becauſe,

3. We anſwer, that if this Text be left out, and the next Verſe be admitted, as it is in *Oecumenius*, the Connexion of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe will not be ſo genuine, ſo coherent, and conſonant without this diſputed Text as with it.

The next Verſe runs thus; *There are Three that bear witneſs in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, and theſe Three agree in One.* Now in the foregoing Verſe there is a fit *Antitheſis* to every Clauſe in this, the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*; the Three Witneſſes in the former Verſe ſtand contradiſtinguiſhed to the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, the Three Witneſſes in this. Again, thoſe Words, *in Heaven*, in the former Verſe, ſtand contradiſtinguiſhed to the Words, *in Earth*, in this; and yet once more thoſe Words, *Theſe Three are One*, in the former Verſe, ſtand in oppoſition to this Clauſe, *Theſe Three agree in One*, in the ſubſequent Verſe. Now if the foregoing

ing Verſe were wholy omitted, the following Verſe for want of a fit ἀντιπόδοσις anſwerable to every Member of it, would ſeem ſomewhat uncouth: For to what end ſhould the Apoſtle tell us of *Three Witneſſes in Earth*, had he not, by way of diſtinction, already mention'd *Three Witneſſes in Heaven*?

Calvin, who well knew that this diſputed Text was not found in ſeveral Copies both Greek and Latin, did yet think fit to receive and interpret it, as a part of St. *John*'s Epiſtle; and he hath left us Two Reaſons why he did ſo, and they are both conſiderable: His firſt Reaſon is this, *Quia contextus optimè fluit, ſi membrum hoc addatur*, becauſe the Context runs beſt if this part be added to it. His ſecond Reaſon is this, *Video in optimis & probatiſſimæ fidei codicibus haberi*; becauſe, ſaith he, I ſee that this Verſe is found in the beſt and moſt approved Copies. by which it appears, that it was

the Opinion of this Judicious Perſon, That this Text, which renders the Series of the Apoſtles Diſcourſe the more agreeable to its ſelf in its ſeveral parts, being found in Copies of the greateſt Credit, ſhould not be caſhiered, barely becauſe in ſome Copies it is left out: So he. But to ſay no more of this.

4. We anſwer, That the Reaſon of that difference, which isfound betwixt ſeveral Copies, ſome *having* this Text, and ſome others *wanting* it, muſt ariſe either from *careleſneſs*, or from *deſign*, or *Forgery*.

1. 'Tis very poſſible that this Text might be omitted through the meer *Careleſneſs* of ſome Tranſcriber, whoſe too much haſt might betray him, or whoſe Eye being oft took off from his Copy, might deceive him. And if this were the Caſe, we cannot wonder that this firſt miſtake ſhould grow and multiply: For if we grant, that any one Copy was made *defective* meer-

merely through the ſupine *negligence* and inadvertency of the Scribe; it muſt of neceſſity follow, that all other Copies, faithfully tranſcribed, and derived ſucceſſively from that, muſt be guilty of the ſame defect; and what number of ſuch Copies there may be in the World, who can tell? And if this little part of St. *John*'s Epiſtle were indeed omitted merely for want of more *Care* and better Intention either of the *Mind* or the *Eye* of ſome Tranſcriber, whoſe Pen this Paſſage eſcaped; ſhall the ſame Paſſage, being found in other Copies more faithfully tranſcribed, be counted the leſs *Authentick?* But,

2. If it will not be allowed, that the firſt omiſſion of this Text was occaſioned by the over-ſight of ſome careleſs *Scribe*; then it muſt needs follow, That if this Text be *Canonical*, it muſt be firſt left out by ſome *fraudulent Deſign*; or if it be not *Canonical*, it muſt at firſt

be put in by down-right *Forgery*.

And indeed such a *fraudulent Design* is on the one hand imputed to those Persons, who in former Ages denied the *Trinity*; and on the other hand, such a down-right *Forgery* is imputed to those Persons who in former times did *own* the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, and did vigorously defend it. Now the question is, whether this imputation of *Fraud* to some, or of *Forgery* to others, do carry the fairer shew of Reason, and consequently the greater probability in it? Methinks this Question may be easily resolved, and the Resolution of it by all impartial and unprejudiced Persons may be as easily believed. For that the Christians of those times, who *professed* and maintained the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, should *forge* this Text, is a Pretence that hath nothing of *Probability* in it: For,

1. Had the learned Men of those times *forged* this Text, and inserted it into several Copies, they might well

well have imagined, that the *Enemies* of their Profeſſion, who were *Active* and *Inquiſitive* Men, would quickly have *detected* ſuch a Forgery, as did ſo much tend to their diſadvantage; and being once detected, they would have objected it to their eternal ſhame; a thing which in thoſe Days, ſo far as I yet know, no Man ever did.

2. The learned Men of thoſe times had not the leaſt *Temptation* to *forge* this Text; for had they done it, they muſt have done it to this end only: namely, to *confirm* that Doctrine of the *Trinity*, which they aſſerted: But that Doctrine being already and ſufficiently eſtabliſhed by a great variety of other Scriptures, and unanſwerable Arguments deduced from them, they had no need to *coin* and counterfeit a new Text to help ſupport it. And is it imaginable, that Men of eminent Piety, who owned the *Holy Spirit* to be God, and as ſuch *adored* him,

would make bold to *counterfeit* his Hand, and lay the *Brats* of their own Brains at his Door? Is it imaginable, that Men who knew the *danger* of adding any thing to the Word of God, ſhould add a Text of their *own* Invention to the Sacred *Canon*, and impoſe it upon the Catholick Church, as if it had Been the immediate Dictate of the *Holy Ghoſt?* We cannot think it conſiſtent with the known Piety of the ancient Fathers, that they ſhould ever coin a *Counterfeit* Text, and then obtrude it upon the World, and make it paſs, as if it bore the *Spirit*'s *Stamp*. Certainly, 'tis no way credible that ſuch Men ſhould, upon any *pinch*, commit ſuch horrid Villainy; but much leſs *Gratis*, without any *need*, without ſo much as a *Temptation* to it.

Now, ſince the Primitive Chriſtians, who *owned* the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, cannot with any Reaſon, and fairly be charged with the *guilt* of *Forgery*, as if they of their

their own motion had ſurreptitiouſly inſerted *this Text* into the Sacred *Canon* : Some other Perſons, more liable to juſt ſuſpicion, muſt of neceſſity be charged with *fraudulent* and ill-dealing in leaving it out. This fraudulent dealing St. *Hierom* imputes, *Infidelibus Tranſlatoribus*, by whom he means, as Authors judge, thoſe *Arian Hereticks*, who had then crept into the *Latin Church*: and in their *Latin* Tranſlations had left out this Verſe, which St. *Hierom* himſelf then found in the *Greek* Copies.

And indeed tho' thoſe ancient Fathers, who *aſſerted* the *Trinity*, had no need to *forge*, and add this Text to the *Canon*; yet they who *denied* the *Trinity*, had a very *ſtrong Temptation* to *leave* it out. For this Text is, as *Eraſmus* ſtyles it, *Telum, quo maximè confici poterunt Ariani* : And again, *efficax telum adverſus Arianos*, An effectual Argument againſt the *Arians*; and doubtleſs ſo it is againſt the

Arians

Arians and the *Sabellians* too. And, upon that ſcore, *Fulgentius*, as cited by *Eſtius*, having mentioned this Text, ſubjoyns theſe Words, *Audiat Sabellius, ſunt, ut audi, tres, & credat eſſe tres perſonas:* And then again. *Audiat & Arius Unum; & non dicat filium differentis eſſe naturæ;* Let *Sabellius* hear, that there are *Three that bear Record in Heaven*; and let him believe that they are *Three Perſons*; let *Arius* alſo hear, That *Theſe Three are One*, and let him no more ſay, That the *Nature* of the *Son* differs from that of the *Father*: For, as the ſame Author ſaith elſewhere, when St. *John* tells us, *Theſe Three are One, Unitatem ſubſtantiæ accipimus*; We take it, that the Apoſtle means the *Unity* of *Subſtance*, ſuch a numerical *Unity* as is peculiar to theſe Three Glorious Perſons: For as a learned Interpreter well obſerves, had the Apoſtle meant no greater Unity than that of *Kind* or *Conſent*, he

Fulg. in libro de Trinitate.

Fulg. in lib. Reponſ. ad decem Ob. Arianorum.

Jac. Capellus in locum.

he had ſaid no more of the bleſſed Trinity, than may be truly ſaid of all the Inhabitants of Heaven; for in reſpect of ſuch an Unity all glorified *Saints* and *Angels* are *One*.

But to conclude this Matter; this Text being generally received as a part of the *Canon*, and being expounded as it is, by pious, learned, and judicious Men, both ancient Fathers, and later Divines, according to the *Analogy* of Faith, and the manifeſt Senſe of many other Scriptures; the Doctrine of the bleſſed *Trinity* ſtands built upon it, as a firm *Baſis*, and an impregnable *Rock*: And methinks in the Judgment of all Men, who are not *wedded* to *Heterodox* Opinions, but are willing to *ſubmit* to *Truth*, the contrary Doctrines of *Ebion*, *Sabellius*, *Photinus*, *Arius*, *Socinus*, and other Hereticks, like *Dagon* before the *Ark*, ſhould fall to the Ground: And indeed every modeſt Man's Underſtanding ſhould

ſhould ſtoop and yield up it ſelf to this Divine Revelation, though it contain ſuch a Doctrine, as doth exceed the Comprehenſion of Humane Reaſon.

3. My third and laſt Work is this; namely, to prove the *Deity* of thoſe Perſons in the Trinity, which hath been, and ſtill is, ſo much diſputed.

As for that *glorious Being*, whom we call the *Firſt*, and Hereticks have thought the *only* Perſon in the Godhead, there is no Controverſie, unleſs it be with perfect *Atheiſts*, who, like other *Monſters*, the Miſcarriages of Nature, are but *few*, and thoſe few condemned by the common conſent of all Nations. The diſpute of old betwixt the *Fathers* and the *Arians*, and the preſent diſpute betwixt *us* and our Modern *Socinians*, doth concern the Deity of the *Second* and *Third* Perſons, each of whom we eſteem and

and religiouſly adore as God, equal with the Father.

To prove the Deity of both theſe Perſons, I ſhall uſe Two ſorts of Texts: Firſt, ſuch Texts as do plainly and moſt expreſly aſcribe to both theſe Perſons the *Name* and *Title* of God. 2. Such Texts as do aſcribe to both theſe Perſons ſuch *Attributes* and *Works* as are peculiar to God alone. I begin with the Second Perſon, whom we commonly call *God* the *Son*. And.

1. There are ſeveral Texts, which do in the moſt plain and expreſs Terms aſcribe to this bleſſed Perſon, the *Name* and *Title* of *God*.

The Evangelical Prophet ſtyles him, the *Mighty God*; and which is much the ſame thing, the *Everlaſting Father*. St. *Thomas*, who knew him well, who ſaw his ſtupendious Miracles, who heard his incomparable Diſcourſes, and was thoroughly acquainted with his holy Life and Iſa. 9. 6.

and Converſation, calls him, *My Lord, and my God.* St. *Paul*, who was an inſpired Apoſtle, and knew well enough what he ſaid or wrote, ſtyles him, *God bleſſed for ever.* St. *John*, who lay in his Boſom, who wrote his Goſpel purpoſely to prove his Deity, ſaith of him, *This is the true God.* Theſe Texts are ſo plain, and ſuch evident proofs of our Lord's Divinity, that our *Socinians*, becauſe they cannot fairly deny them, endeavour to elude them by a diſtinction. Accordingly they tell us, that there is a *God* by *Nature*, and there are *Gods* by *Office*: Kings, Princes, and other Supreme Magiſtrates, who are *Men* by *Nature*, yet in regard of their *Authority*, being the Deputies and Vicegerents of God in governing this lower World do bear his *Name*, and are called *Gods*. The King, ſaith a learned Man, is, Ζεὺς χθόνιος, an *Earthly Jupiter*, a Terreſtrial Deity: And ſo the Pſalmiſt ſaith of Magiſtrates, *I have ſaid, ye are Gods*:

Joh. 20. 28.

Rom. 9. 5.

1 Joh. 5. 20.

Zetzes in Comment. in Heſiodum.

Pſ. 81. 6.

Gods: And ſo God Almighty told *Moſes*, *I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*. Now, ſuch a God do our *Socinians* allow our Lord to be, and no more; a *God* by *Office*, a *Metaphorical* or *Equivocal* God; who hath the *Name*, but not the real *Nature* of a *God* indeed. Exod. 7. 1.

But how can this conſiſt with thoſe glorious Titles, which St. *Paul* gives our Lord, where he mentions, *The Glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt?* That both theſe Titles, the *Great God* and *Saviour*, do equally belong to our Lord, and were by the Apoſtle intended for him, we have the opinion of conſiderable Perſons; and for their being of that judgment they are commended too. 'Tis a Learned Man, who ſaith, *Benè faciunt, qui utrumque hic Prædicatum ad idem ſubjectum, nempe Chriſtum, referunt*. They, who refer both theſe Titles, the *Mighty God* and *Saviour*, to Chriſt, do well. And ſo doth *Oecumenius*, Tit. 2. 13. Jo. Pricæus in Annot. in locum.

φανερῶς

φανερῶς θεὸν μέγαν τ χεισὸν ὁμολογεῖ. St. *Paul* doth here manifeſtly acknowledge, that Chriſt is the *Great God*. So thought *Theophylact* too, who ſpeaks thus to ſuch as denied our Lord's Divinity; ἀκουέτωσαν ὅτι καὶ θεός ἐστι, καὶ μέγας, Let them hear St. *Paul* ſaying, that he is *God*, and the *Great God*. Of the ſame mind was St. *Chryſoſtom* too; who, taking it for granted, that both theſe Titles do indeed belong to our Lord, breaks out into this Expreſſion; πῦ εἰσιν οἱ τὸ πατρὸς ἐλάττονα τ υἱὸν λέγοντες; Where are they, who ſay that the Son is inferiour to the Father, ſince St. *Paul* doth here ſtyle him, the *Great God*?

Oecumen. Theoph. & Chryſoſt. in locum.

The ſame Interpretation of theſe words is given by *Druſius*, who ſaith, *Non ſolùm Deus, ſed etiam Deus Magnus vocatur hic Chriſtus:* Chriſt is here called, not only *God*, but the *Great God*. And ſo *Cornelius à Lapide*, *Filium hic utrobique intelligi patet*: It is manifeſt, ſaith he, that by both theſe Titles, the *Great*

Great God and *Saviour*, the *Son* is underſtood. And indeed there is very good reaſon for it.

For the Text mentions, *The Glorious Appearance of the Great God and Saviour*; which without all controverſie, relates to the *Day* of *Judgment*; wherein, not God the *Father*, but the *Son*, ſhall viſibly and gloriouſly appear, and ſit as Judge. Beſides, the want of an Article in the Original before the word Σωτῆρ, *Saviour*, is an intimation, that S. *Paul* doth here mean but *one* ſingle Perſon: For, if by the *Great God*, he had meant the *Father*, as by the *Saviour*, he muſt mean the *Son*; he would, in all probability, have uſed the Article τοῦ, as a Note of *Diſtinction* between them; that being the known and common uſe of that Article in other Authors.

Now then, if from the force and Phraſe of the Text, and the Authority of theſe and other judicious Interpreters, we may conclude, that our bleſſed Saviour

is indeed the Perſon here called the *Great God*; this glorious Title muſt needs diſtinguiſh him from, and advance him far above, all thoſe Perſons, who, by vertue of ſome *great Office*, are *Nominal* and *Titular Gods*, and no more.

That any *Prince*, by vertue of his *Office*, was ever ſtyled, the *Great God*, is more than I do yet know; I read, that ſome notorious *Sycophants* have ſtyled the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, *Pontifex Maximus*, the *Greateſt* of *Prieſts*. Nay more, *Dominus Deus noſter Papa*; Our *Lord God* the Pope; but not *Magnus Deus*, our *Great* God the Pope. It's true, that Idol of the *Epheſians* was called, the *Great Goddeſs Diana*: And that Sorcerer *Simon Magus*, was ſtyled by the bewitched *Samaritans*, the *Great Power of God*; and to him was there a Statue erected at *Rome* with this Inſcription, *Simoni Sancto Deo:* To *Simon*, not the *Great*, but the *Holy* God. The King of *Perſia*, and the King of *Aſſyria*,

Lorinus in Acti. c. 8. com. 24.

Aſſyria, did, each of them, ſtyle himſelf, ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς, the *Great King*, but the Title of the *Great God*, ſo far as I know, was never yet given to any mortal Man, ſave only *Pſaphon*, who, to make himſelf *adored* as a *Deity*, ſent abroad ſeveral Birds, being firſt taught to Sing, Μέγας Θεὸς Ψάφων; *Pſaphon* is a *Great God*. Cæl. Rhod. Antiq. Lect. l. 3. c. 5.

But *Eraſmus*, who is obſerved to be too kind to the *Arians*, tells us, that ſome Men of their Perſwaſion, being induced, as may be well ſuppoſed, by this Text; *Chriſtum Magnum Deum fatentur, ſed verum negant*, do confeſs, that *Chriſt* is a *Great God*, but deny that he is a *True* one. 'Tis very ſtrange that Men ſhould be of ſuch an opinion, conſidering what St. *John* ſaith of our Lord, *This is the True God*: But doth he mean the *Father* or the *Son*? Of that we may judge by his words immediately foregoing: For, having ſaid, *We are in him, that is true, even in his Son*

Jeſus Chriſt, he ſubjoyns theſe words, not a ſyllable intervening; *This is the True God:* i. e. in common conſtruction, *This Jeſus Chriſt*, the Perſon laſt mentioned.

'Tis a Rule in *Grammar*, That when there are *two Antecedents*, the *Relative Hic, This*, doth generally relate, *ad Poſterius & Propius*, to that Antecedent, which is the *latter* and the *nearer* to it. Suppoſe we then that there be two Antecedents here in the Context; God the *Father*, one; and *Jeſus Chriſt*, the other; the firſt being at a diſtance from the Relative, and the ſecond being contiguous to it, the Relative muſt, according to the Rule of *Grammar*, and Propriety of Speech, refer to the latter; and then the Apoſtle's meaning is, Jeſus Chriſt is the True God.

And this Interpretation of the Text is much confirmed by the words that follow; *This is the True God, and Life Eternal*, i. the

Joh. 10. 28.

Author

Author and giver of Life Eternal; and who is that, our Lord anſwers, *I give unto them Eternal Life:* And again, *I am the Life*: And ſo St. *John*, *He that hath the Son, hath Life*: And to the ſame purpoſe run many other Texts. Now, ſince St. *John* expreſly ſaith of *One* and the ſame Perſon, *This is the True God:* And, *This is the Life Eternal.* And ſince by, *This Life Eternal*, he muſt needs, according to many other Scriptures, underſtand our bleſſed *Saviour*, who is the Fountain of Life; we have all reaſon to believe, that, when he ſaith, *This is the True God*, he means him too.

Joh. 11. 25. 1 Joh. 5. 12.

But becauſe, notwithſtanding theſe Evidences, our *Socinians* may raiſe ſome Cavils againſt this Interpretation, and endeavour, without juſt reaſon, to divert theſe Scriptures to another ſenſe; to prove that our Lord is more than a *God* by *Office*, to theſe Texts I ſhall add two Arguments.

1. My firſt Argument is this: That bleſſed Perſon, who was a God *before* the *Creation*, is more than a *God* by *Office*. But our Saviour is that bleſſed Perſon, who was a God before the Creation.

The Major Propoſition may be thus explained: Gods by *Office* are ſo termed only in reſpect of that *Authority* and Government, which God Almighty hath by his Providence committed to them. But before the Creation there was no occaſion for, no uſe of any ſuch delegated Power; there were none ſuch to govern, there were none to be governed; and conſequently there could then be no God by Office.

But our bleſſed Saviour was a God even then; for, St. *John* ſaith of him, *the word was God*: But when was he ſo? the Text anſwers; *In the beginning*: which muſt needs import ſome ſpace at leaſt before the Creation, becauſe
Joh. 1. 3. it follows, *All things were made by him*;

him; which must of necessity suppose his own *Præexistence*; and if our Lord were a God, when there could be no *God* by *Office*; he must be God under another Notion, even by *Nature*, and from all Eternity.

2. My Second Argument shall be this, That blessed Person, who *now* is, and *will* be a God, when the World shall be at an end, is more than a God by Office. But our blessed Saviour is, and will be such a God.

To such as are *Gods* by *Office*, and no more, God Almighty speaks thus by the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods, but ye shall die like Men.* Ps. 81. 6. And when once they die, their Authority ceaseth, their Breath and their Authority, and with it their *Godship*, expire together.

But 'tis not thus with our blessed Saviour; for tho' the Offices of his Mediatorship shall one day cease; yet his Power, Authority, Isa. 9. 7.

and Government ſhall laſt for ever; when he ſhall be no longer King of Nations, he ſhall ſtill remain King of Saints. For the Evangelical Prophet hath given us this Aſſurance, *Of his Government there ſhall be no end.* And to him God the Father hath ſaid, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: And him doth St. *Paul* ſtyle, *God bleſſed for ever.* And are theſe the Characters of *Gods* by *Office?* Doth their Government laſt for ever? And are they Gods ſitting upon a Throne to Eternity? Are they Gods Bleſſed without an end? 'Tis well for *Gods* by *Office*, if when they die, and their *Godſhip* ceaſeth, they prove ſo much as *Saints*, and Companions fit to converſe with *Angels.* 'Tis our bleſſed Saviour, who is ſuch a God as juſtly deſerves that Character which *Homer* beſtows upon thoſe falſly ſuppoſed Deities, whom he ſtyles, Αἰὲν ἐόντες, 'Tis our Lord who was from Eternity, and whoſe

Heb. 1. 8.

whoſe Perſon and Deity ſhall exiſt for ever. To him we may ſay, as the Pſalmiſt doth, *From everlaſting to everlaſting thou art God.*

Now theſe Texts that I have named, and theſe Arguments which I have urged, I think, are ſuch as our *Socinians* can never fairly anſwer; I conceive them ſufficient to confute the pretence of thoſe Men, who, becauſe they cannot deny that our bleſſed Saviour is once and again ſtyled a God, that they may with ſome little colour rob him of his Eſſential Divinity, do give it out, That he is a *God* by *Office*, as many other Men have been, and no more. But to go on.

2. There are ſeveral Texts which aſcribe to our bleſſed Saviour ſuch *Attributes* and ſuch *Works*, as do plainly prove him *God*, and that in the ſtricteſt and moſt proper Senſe of that Notion, as it imports a Being Omnipotent, Omniſcient,

niſcient, Omnipreſent, &c. From which Attributes, and the Effects of them, we may raiſe Arguments enough, and very ſufficient, to prove him the *true God*. As for inſtance;

1. That bleſſed Perſon, who is *Omnipotent*, who can by his own Almighty Power do whatever he will, whatever can be done, is the true God. But ſuch an Omnipotent Perſon is our bleſſed Saviour.

The utmoſt Power of *Men* and *Angels* is ſo *reſtrained* and limited, that they cannot do whatever may be done, at leaſt by any ſtrength which is their own. But now 'tis otherwiſe with God, that God who thus demands, *Is there any thing too hard for me?* To this Queſtion we may anſwer in the Words of *Job*, *I know that thou canſt do every thing*: So ſaith our Lord, *With God all things are poſſible*. Whatſoever is not *contradictory* to *Truth*, whatſoever is not *repug-*

Jer. 32. 27.

Job 42. 2.

Mar. 19. 26.

repugnant to his own *Perfections*, whatever he can *Will*, he can alſo do, and he alone.

The Devil indeed can play Tricks, and work lying Wonders, as he did by the Magicians in *Egypt*, and *Simon Magus*; but real Miracles he cannot do. Their Demand was reaſonable, who put this Queſtion, *Can a Devil open the Eyes of the blind?* 'Tis ſure he cannot. We alſo read, that *Moſes*, and ſome of the *Prophets*, and our Lord's *Apoſtles* did ſeveral real Miracles; but yet they could not work them, *when*, *where* and as *oft* as they pleaſed. So complained the Father of a Lunatick Son, *I brought him to thy Diſciples, and they could not cure him.* Doubtleſs they did attempt a Cure, but in vain. And the Reaſon muſt be this; The Power, whereby they wrought other Miracles, was not their own, and the efficacious exerciſe of it was lent them upon a Condition, wherein at that time they failed. But

Joh. 10. 21.

Mat. 17. 16

But that our bleſſed Saviour was and is a Perſon of Omnipotent Power, able at all times, and in all Caſes, to do whatſoever his Pleaſure was, is, or ſhall be, may be proved by theſe Four Arguments.

1. The Omnipotent Power of Chriſt may be proved by the *Miracles* which he wrought in his own Perſon whilſt he converſed in this lower World.

What his Miracles were the Evangeliſt tells us, *The blind receive their ſight, and the lame Walk, the Lepers are cleanſed, and the Deaf hear, the dead are raiſed up.* The truth of his Miracles was not denied by his moſt bitter Enemies: The *Phariſees* themſelves who perſecuted his Perſon to the Death, did thus confeſs, *This Man doth many Miracles.* And as his Miracles were *more* in number, ſo were they *greater* in their Nature, and in their Circumſtances, than had ever been wrought amongſt them;

Mat. 11. 5.

them; for why elſe did the amazed Multitude cry out, *It was never ſo ſeen in Iſrael?* Mat. 9. 33.

That his raiſing the dead only by his Word; that his cleanſing a Leper only by his Will; that his curing a Centurion's Servant, and a Nobleman's Son at a diſtance, no natural means being uſed; that when he had fed Five thouſand Perſons with Five Loaves, and Two Fiſhes, the Fragments that were left, ſhould be a greater Quantity than the whole Bread at firſt; that his curing a blind Man with a Cataplaſm of Spittle and Clay, a thing more likely to *put* out *ſeeing Eyes* than to *enlighten blind* ones, I ſay, that theſe and other Miracles of his ſhould ever be wrought by the proper Power or Art of any *mere* Man, Is utterly impoſſible. And ſo *Nicodemus* rightly judged, when he ſpake thus to our Lord, *No Man can do theſe Miracles which thou doſt, except God be with him.* Joh. 3. 2.

And

And that God was with him indeed, is evident from ſeveral Expreſſions. That of our Lord is
Joh. 8. 29. one; *The Father hath not left me alone.* St. *Paul* tells us, that in
Act. 10. 38. working Miracles, *God was with him*; and not only *with him*, but *in him* too: So ſaith the ſame
Col. 2. 9. Apoſtle, *In him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*, *i.* ſaith a learned Interpreter of our own
Davenant. in Col. 2. 9. Church, *per unionem Hypoſtaticam*, by a Perſonal Union; an Union ſo cloſe, that our Lord ſaith elſewhere, *The Father is in me, and I in him*; and by reaſon of this Inhabitation, which, I think, the *Greek* Fathers mean by their περιχώρησις,
Joh. 10. 38, 39. our Saviour ſaith, *I and my Father are One*: How One? One in *Eſſence*, and conſequently One, as in all other Perfections, ſo in point of *Power*.

They indeed, who unjuſtly deny the Hypoſtatical Union of the Divine and Humane Natures in the Perſon of Chriſt, may by a juſt

juſt Conſequence, were their Opinion true, affirm that our Lord wrought all his Miracles, not by his own Power; but, as other Men did, by a Power that was only lent him. But ſince St. *John* tells us, *The Word was made Fleſh*; ſince St. *Paul* ſaith, *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*; and the ſame Apoſtle in one place ſtyles our Saviour, *God bleſſed for ever*; and in another place, *The Man Chriſt Jeſus*. We muſt either deny the Authority of theſe Texts, or elſe confeſs that our Lord certainly is both God and Man; and that the Miracles which he did whilſt he appeared in his Humane Nature, were done by the Power of *his own* Divinity, and that power was Omnipotent. For he did ſuch Miracles, and with ſuch Circumſtances, as could never have been done by any power leſs than that Omnipotent one of God, and that Omnipotence was his own.

Joh. 1. 14. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Rom. 9. 5. 1 Tim. 2. 5.

The

Mar. 4. 39. The Evangeliſt tells us, *He rebuked the Wind*, and *ſaid unto the Sea, Peace, be ſtill: And there was a great Calm*: His Diſciples being amazed at this, *ſaid one to another, What manner of Man is this, that even the Wind and the Sea obey him?*

Theoph. in locum. He that could do this, ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει, ſaith *Theophylact*; ſeemed to them to be, and indeed was, more than a Man. For, as Joh. 3. 8. our Lord ſaith, *The Wind bloweth where it liſteth*; 'Tis not in the Power of Man to prevent it; no, to have a command over Wind and Water is God's Prerogative; and as ſuch doth the Pſalmiſt men- Pſ. 107. 29. tion it: *He makes the Storm a Calm.* 'Tis mentioned as an Argument of Pſ. 89. 8. God's Omnipotence: *O Lord God of Hoſts, who is a ſtrong Lord like unto thee?* And the very firſt inſtance of God's infinite Power there given is this, *Thou ruleſt the raging of the Sea; and when the Waves thereof ariſe, thou ſtilleſt them.* 'Tis an Act of Divine Omnipotence;

nipotence; and ſince our Saviour did it, 'tis an Evidence of his own Almighty power, and ſuch a Power muſt needs prove him God.

2. That our bleſſed Saviour was a Perſon, who had an Omnipotent Power of his own, is evident from thoſe miraculous Works which were done by his Apoſtles, both before his Death, and after his Aſcenſion.

During the time of our Lord's converſing in the World, the generality of Perſons, who wanted help in any kind, making their Applications to his own Perſon, we do not find many Inſtances of miraculous Works done by his Apoſtles, whilſt he himſelf was with them; only when he had ſent them abroad, the Evangeliſt tells us, That when they were returned, *They told him all that they had done*; many Miracles no doubt, though they are not particularly recorded. The Seventy Diſciples Luk. 9. 10.

Luk. 10. 17 mention but one, namely this, *Even the Devils are ſubject to us.* Doubtleſs the Devil, who is cal-
Joh. 14. 30. led *The Prince of this World*, and is a very powerful Spirit, is ſo loath to quit his Poſſeſſions, that nothing leſs than Omnipotence can eject and turn him out.

But when once our Lord had left the World, and no more immediate Addreſſes could be made to him as a viſible and preſent Perſon; they who wanted extraordinary help in ſeveral Caſes, betook themſelves to his Apoſtles, and found that relief from them, which they could not find elſewhere. St. *Luke*
Act. 2. 43. tells us, *Many Wonders and Signs were done by the Apoſtles*: And a-
Act. 19. 11. gain he mentions *ſpecial Miracles wrought by the hands of Paul*: They healed the Sick, cured the Lame, and raiſed the dead; ſuch mighty Works they did, that they were took for *Gods* in the ſhape of Men.

Nor

Nor indeed can we much wonder that it ſhould be ſo; that thoſe Perſons ſhould miſtake our Lord's Apoſtles for *Gods*, who ſaw them do ſuch Works as were far above the Power of *Men*. The Spectators of thoſe Miracles ſaw the Inſtruments who were employed about them, and looked no farther, the Hand that did them being inviſible. And whoſe Hand that was, St. *Luke* informs us; *God wrought ſpecial Miracles by the Hands of Paul*. *Paul* was but a Tool, the Workman was God; and not the *Father* only, but the *Son* too; for to him did St. *Peter* aſcribe the miraculous Cure of a Man who had been lame from his Infancy, *His Name*, (*the Name of Chriſt*) *hath made this man ſtrong*, &c. Act. 3. 16. And that the Apoſtles did indeed work their Miracles by our Lord's Authority, is yet more evident from the Cure of *Æneas*, who had kept his Bed eight years, of which we have this Account; *Peter ſaid* Act. 9. 34.

unto him, Æneas, ariſe, and make thy Bed: And he aroſe immediately. Here was an eaſie, and a very quick Cure indeed; but by whom was it wrought? not by *Peter* himſelf, who told his Patient thus, *Jeſus Chriſt maketh thee whole.* That Power whereby the Apoſtles wrought their Miracles, their Lord, whoſe preſence went along with them, was pleaſed to exert, when any juſt occaſion did ſo require. Accordingly the Evangeliſt tells us, That when he ſent them firſt
Mat. 10. 1. abroad, *He gave them power over unclean Spirits to caſt them out, and to heal all manner of Sickneſs*, &c. And certainly, our Lord gave them nothing but that which was his *own*; ſince he communicated ſuch a Power to his Servants, as enabled them to be inſtrumental in working ſo many mighty Miracles, we muſt conclude, That he had ſuch a Power, and in a far greater meaſure, *Originally* in himſelf; even ſuch an Omnipotent Power,

Power, as ſtill proves him God. But,

3. That our bleſſed Saviour is a Perſon, who had and ſtill hath an Omnipotent Power, may be ſtrongly proved by the *Reſurrection* from the dead; I mean other Men's and his own too.

1. That our bleſſed Saviour is a Perſon, who had and ſtill hath an Omnipotent Power, may be ſtrongly proved by the Reſurrection of other Men from the dead.

There are not many Articles of our Creed, which ſeem more difficult to Humane Reaſon, which have been more impugned, doubted, and denied by Jews and Pagans, than that, which concerns the Reſurrection of the dead. It hath been thought by ſome to be *needleſs*, by others to be *inconvenient*; and, which is to my preſent purpoſe, by many it hath been judged *impoſſible*. Such an intimation we have from St. *Paul*, who thus argued this Matter with

Acts 26. 8. King *Agrippa*; *Why ſhould it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God ſhould raiſe the dead?* Hence 'tis evident, that they were of the ſame opinion with *Celſus* in *Origen*, who ſaid of the Reſurrection, that 'tis a Work, which God, ὅτε βούλεται, ὅτε δύναται, neither will do, nor can.

And indeed the great difficulty of this Work is evident from that demand of God to his Prophet;

Ezek. 37. 3. *Son of Man, can theſe dry Bones live?* Is it poſſible to revive them? certainly not to Men or Angels; and, for that reaſon, they who told the Ruler of the Synagogue,

Mar. 5. 35. *Thy Daughter is dead*, added this withal, *why troubleſt thou the Maſter any further?* It was their opinion, that Chriſt himſelf in ſuch a caſe could do no good. Nor had theſe Men been at all miſtaken, had not our Lord been a far greater Perſon, than the Jews did then ſuppoſe him to be; had he had no more Power, than could belong

belong to the Son of *Mary*, as merely ſuch; to a dead Perſon his preſence, and his very beſt aſſiſtances would have proved but vain.

But we are well aſſured that our Lord did revive, not only this dead Woman, but ſeveral dead Men too; and hath engaged himſelf, that he will one day raiſe all the reſt. For thus he hath told us, *The dead ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear, ſhall live*: And again, *I will raiſe him up at the laſt day.* 'Tis mentioned as an Act of his *own* Power; why elſe did he ſay, *I am the Reſurrection and the Life?* We cannot doubt, but he, who ſpake theſe Words, and made theſe Promiſes, knew his *own* Power to perform them; and that Power muſt be Omnipotent, and this Act of that Omnipotence doth again prove him to be no leſs than God. It's true, his Apoſtles raiſed the dead, and yet were not Gods: But here's

Joh. 5. 25.

Joh. 6. 40.

Joh. 11. 25.

the difference, they did it by *his* Power, but he by *his* own.

2. That our bleſſed Saviour was, and ſtill is, a Perſon of an Almighty Power, may be ſtrongly proved by his own Reſurrection from the Grave.

That our Lord did indeed ariſe from the Grave is an undoubted Article of our Creed; 'tis confirmed by the united Teſtimonies of good Men and glorious Angels; 'tis proved by ſuch undeniable Arguments, as cannot fail us. The *Truth* of our Lord's Reſurrection being granted, all the Queſtion is touching the *Authour* of it; whether it were *himſelf*, or ſome *other* Perſon. It may be demanded, whether a Man truly dead, as our Lord was, be in any capacity to revive himſelf, to come out of his Grave, and live a ſecond life: 'Tis that, which no mere Man ever did or can do; and yet our Lord did it.

Plutarch

Plutarch indeed tells us, That *Cleomedes* and *Alcmena* being dead, revived. *Plato* writes, That one *Er*, an *Armenian* Soldier, being ſlain in a Battel, lay dead in the Field ten days together, and afterwards being carried home to be buried, δωδεκαταῖος ἀνεβίω, the 12th day he revived and lived again. And *Herodotus* reports, That one *Ariſtæus*, being dead and prepared for Burial, his Body vaniſhed, and after ſeven Years was found *alive* in *Proconneſus*. Were any of theſe Stories true, theſe Perſons muſt be revived by ſome *other* Power, whereas our Lord aroſe by *his own*.

Herodotus in Melpomene. p. 230.

True it is, our Lord is ſometimes ſaid in a *Paſſive* ſenſe, ἐγερθῆναι, to be Raiſed; and ſometimes in an *Active* ſenſe, Ἀναστῆναι, to *riſe* again. But this variety of Expreſſion doth not alter the Nature of the thing, nor weaken the Argument which I am drawing from it; for, our Lord's Reſurrection in either ſenſe,

is

is an undeniable proof of his Omnipotence. When he is ſaid *Actively* to *riſe*, 'tis meant, that ſo he did by his *own* Power; and when he is ſaid *Paſſively* to *be* raiſed, 'tis meant, that his *Humane* Nature was raiſed by his *Divine*, that the *God* raiſed the *Man*.

Nor is this, *gratis dictum*; 'Tis not ſaid without a ſufficient ground: For, that our Lord did not want a Power able enough to raiſe himſelf from the Grave, is evident
Joh. 10. 18. from that expreſſion of his, *I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again.* Certainly, by the taking of his life again, he can mean nothing elſe but his Reſurrection from the dead: For, as *Druſius* ſaith, *Animam ponit, qui moritur; aſſumit, qui reſurgit:* He layeth down his life, who dieth; and he reſumes his life, who riſeth again: and ſo to do, our Lord doth here claim a ſufficient Power. And ſurely, ſince our Lord did uſe this power to raiſe *other* dead Perſons,

ſons, he would much more uſe it to raiſe *himſelf*; eſpecially conſidering to what a glorious eſtate his Reſurrection would and did advance him.

This Power of his to take his life again at his pleaſure, is very highly and very juſtly magnified by the Fathers: St. *Chryſoſtom* calleth it, Θαυμαστὸν καὶ παράδοξον, a thing very *ſtrange* and *wonderful*: *Theophylact* ſaith, That it proves our Lord to be, τῷ θανάτου δεσπότην, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἄρχοντα, the Sovereign Lord and Commander both of Death and Life: And St. *Athanaſius* ſpeaks of it thus; Ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν λαβεῖν ὅτε θέλει τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀνθρώπου τοῦτο ἴδιον οὐκ ἔστι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Λόγου δυνάμεως ἔργον: To have a power to reaſſume a departed Soul, is by no means the property of Men, but it belongs to, and is an evidence of the power of the Word, *i.* of Chriſt. That bleſſed Lord of ours, whom St. *Cyprian* thus

Athan. contra Arianos Or. 4. p. 508. Cypr. de paſſ. Chriſti. p. 337.

Cypria. de passione Christi. p. 337. Edit. Purifiis.

thus beſpeaks: *Tu, Domine, qui Poteſtativè ponis animam, & Poteſtativè reſumis.* An expreſſion, which ſheweth that our Lord had as much power to *reſume* his life, as he had to *lay* it down; it was wholly at his own choice to die, and it was in his own power to raiſe and revive himſelf again, even when he pleaſed. And as his capacity to die ſhewed the *Infirmity* of his *Humane* Nature, ſo his *Ability* to *raiſe* himſelf proved his *Omnipotence*, and that Act of Omnipotence did again prove him God. But yet once more:

4. That our bleſſed Saviour is a Perſon, who had and ſtill hath an Almighty Power, may be yet further and ſtrongly proved by the works of Creation and Providence.

Works of Creation, and conſequently of Providence, the Scriptures do every where aſcribe to

Gen. 1. 1. *God*; ſo *Moſes*, *God created the Heaven and the Earth*; And ſo a-

Exod. 20. gain, *The Lord made Heaven and Earth,*

Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is. 'Tis he, whom the Evangelical Prophet ſtyles, *The Everlaſting God, the Lord, the Creatour of the Ends of the Earth.* And indeed it muſt needs be ſo; for, ſince Creation is, *Productio Entis ex non Ente*, the production of *ſomething* out of *nothing*, there being a vaſt diſtance betwixt theſe two Terms, it muſt be the effect of an Infinite Power, and ſuch power there is none, ſave only that of God. Eſa. 40. 28.

Now, that our bleſſed Saviour did create the World, we are told again and again: St. *John* ſaith, *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made, that was made.* St. *Paul* tells us, *By him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, viſible and inviſible.* And again, *God by him made the Worlds*: But how by him? Not by him, as a *Man*, for then he was not ſuch: Not by him, as a *Servant*, not as an *Inſtrument*; for, our Lord ſaith, Joh. 1. 3. Col. 1. 16. Heb. 1. 2.

My

Joh. 5. 17. *My Father worketh, and I work.* Here he ſpeaks of himſelf, not as a *Tool* in his Father's hand, but as a *Fellow-worker* with him.

But had not our Lord's Power been equal with his Father's, had he been no more than a Creature, he could have had no hand in the work of Creation. St. *Auſtin* tells us, *Nec malos, ſed nec bonos Angelos fas eſt putare Creatores:* 'Tis not lawful to think that evil Angels, no nor good ones, can be Creators. So thought *Bellarmine*, *Nullam Creaturam poſſe Inſtrumentaliter concurrere ad Creationem.* And before him *Aquinas*, who ſets this down as a certain concluſion, *Impoſſibile eſt, quòd alicui Creaturæ conveniat creare, neque virtute propria, neque inſtrumentaliter, ſive per Miniſterium: i.* 'Tis impoſſible for any Creature to create any thing, either by its *own* Power, or as an *Inſtrument* in anothers hand. 'Tis the judgment of theſe and other learned Men, that a Creating Power,

Aug. de Trin. l. 3. cap. 8. Tom. 3.

Bellarm. de effectu Sacram. l. 2. cap. 11. p. 156.

Aquin. 1. par. qu. 45. Art. 5.

Power, through the Incapacity of all Creatures to be the Subjects of it, is abſolutely *incommunicable*.

And if ſo, ſince we are ſure that our Lord had an equal Hand with his Father and his Holy Spirit in creating the Univerſe, we muſt conclude, That he hath an equal Power, and that Power being Omnipotent, he is and muſt be God. And that is my firſt Argument to prove him ſo.

2. That bleſſed Perſon, who is *Omniſcient*, is truly God: But our bleſſed Saviour is a Perſon that is Omniſcient.

'Tis ſaid of Man in common, *We are but of yeſterday, and know nothing*. we are ſo far from knowing every thing that comparatively we know very little or nothing. But as for God, that is truly affirmed of him, which can be affirmed of none beſides, *His Underſtanding is infinite*: To him St. *Paul* ſaith, *All things are naked*

Job. 8. 9.

Pſ. 147. 5.

Heb. 4. 13.

naked and open; ſo they are to him, and to him alone: And yet ſo they were, are, and ever will be to our bleſſed Saviour: So ſaid
Joh. 21. 17 St. *Peter*, *Lord, thou knoweſt all things*: And ſo the other Apoſtles,
Joh. 16. 30 *Lord, we are ſure that thou knoweſt all things*, even ſuch things as paſs the knowledge of Men and Angels: As, to inſtance in Two Particulars.

1. 'Tis certain that our Lord knew the *Hearts*, underſtood the *Thoughts*, the ſecret Inclinations, and inward Affections of Men.

Jer. 17. 9. The Prophet tells us, *The Heart is deceitful above all things, who can know it*? What Man doth know his Neighbour's Heart? nay, What Man doth perfectly know his own? ſo to do is the peculiar Prerogative of Heaven; ſo the next Verſe
Pſ. 139. 1, 2 tells us, *I the Lord ſearch the Heart*; ſo the Pſalmiſt found it, *O Lord, thou haſt ſearched me, and known me, thou underſtandeſt my Thought afar off*, i. *antequam ſit*, even before

fore I think it. Such a Καρδιογνώστης, a Knower of *Hearts* was our bleſſed Saviour; for St. *John* tells us, *He knew what was in Man*: And St. *Luke* ſaith, *He knew their Thoughts*. Nay, it ſeems very evident from the Series of the Evangelical Hiſtory, that our Lord *foreknew* the Inclinations and Thoughts of Men before the Men themſelves were acquainted with them. St. *John* tells us, *Jeſus knew from the beginning who ſhould betray him*, even before *Judas* had any *thought* of it, or *Temptation* to it. And certainly St. *Peter* had no thought of denying his Lord, when he ſaid, *That he would rather die than deny him*; and yet our Lord *foreſaw* that he would ſurely do it.

Joh. 2. 25. Luk. 6. 8. Joh 6. 64.

Now the Queſtion is, How came our Lord by this *Preſcience* and Fore-knowledge of his? All the Knowledge of Man is either *natural*, or *acquired*, or *infuſed*, and from Divine Revelation. If we

conſider our bleſſed Saviour as a meer Man; 'tis certain that all his natural or acquired Knowledge could never enable him to underſtand the Thoughts, and foreſee the Inclinations of Men; and if ſo, he muſt needs do this, as he was Man, by Divine Revelation.

But if our Lord knew the Hearts and Thoughts of other Men by a Divine Revelation, it may be ſaid, that ſuch a Knowledge cannot prove him God; for ſuch a Knowledge hath been found in ſome other Perſons, in Prophets and Apoſtles, who yet were no more than Men. When *Eliſha* told *Hazael*, *I know the Evil that thou wilt do*; he knew the Heart of *Hazael* better than himſelf; for he thus replyed, *Is thy Servant a Dog, that he ſhould do this great thing?* And yet he did it. St. *Paul* tells us, that there was in his time *a gift of diſcerning Spirits*, *i.* either of that inward *Sincerity*, or ſecret

2 Reg. 8. 12, 13.

1 Chr. 12. 10.

ſecret *Hypocriſie*, that lay hid in the Hearts of Men. Such a diſcerning of Spirits very probably was found in St. *Peter*, when he attacked *Ananias* thus, *Why hath Satan filled thy Heart to lye to the Holy Ghoſt*? And yet again, *Why haſt thou conceived this thing in thy Heart*? Upon which Words *Lorinus* makes this Obſervation, *Hic deprehenditur Petro communicata divinitùs occultarum rerum ſcientia*; From hence we may perceive that God was pleaſed to communicate to St. *Peter* the Knowledge of *ſecret* things: For ſuch was the Fraud and Hypocriſie of *Ananias*, which could not probably be diſcovered to St. *Peter* by any *Informations* from *Men*, but by *Revelation* from *God*. Now if we ſuppoſe and take this for a granted Truth, That St. *Peter* knew the *Heart* of *Ananias*, and the diſſimulation that lurked therein, by an immediate *Revelation* from God; yet notwithſtanding *Peter* himſelf

Act. 5. 3.

Lorinus in locum.

ſtill remained no more than a mere mortal *Man*. And if ſo, how can any ſuch Knowledge, gained by *Revelation*, prove our Saviour to be a God? To which demand I thus reply:

1. That Knowledge which our Saviour had of the *Hearts* of Men, was a great deal *larger*, and much more *extenſive* than that Knowledge, which any *Prophets* or *Apoſtles* ever had. For whereas they underſtood the Hearts only of ſome very *few* particular Men, and that upon ſome *extraordinary* and emergent occaſion, worthy of a new Revelation; 'tis expreſly ſaid of
Joh. 2. 24. our Lord, *He knew all Men*. Upon which Words *Theophylact* hath this Paraphraſe, Ὀυ διελάνθανεν αὐτὸν ὕιος ἦν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐν ἑκάςῳ ἀνθρώπῳ. Our Lord was not ignorant what were the Thoughts of *every* Mans Heart; and certainly ſuch an Univerſal Knowledge ſpeaks him more than a Man, for no mere Man ever had it, or can attain it.

St.

St. *Paul* was an inſpired Perſon, and had abundance of Revelations, and yet he thus profeſſeth, *We know but in part.* No; who it is that hath an Univerſal Knowledge St. *John* tells us, *God is greater than our Hearts, and knoweth All things.* This Omniſcience is peculiar to God alone; and if ſo, ſince it was found in our bleſſed Lord, who knew the Hearts of all Men, which no *Prophet* or *Apoſtle* ever did, he muſt be truly God. 1 Joh. 3. 20

2. That Knowledge which our Saviour had of the *Hearts* and *Thoughts* of Men, differed from that of the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, as in its *Extenſion*, ſo in reſpect of its *Cauſe*, Ground, and Principle; they received all this Knowledge by *Revelation*, and by that alone, which our Lord did not do; they had all their Knowledge of Mens Hearts from *another*, but his he had of and from *himſelf.*

The diſcerning of Spirits by our Lord's Apoſtles, or ſome few other Apoſtolical Men is call'd a Gift, and whoſe Gift both that and ſome other were, St. *Paul* tells us, *All theſe worketh that One and the ſame Spirit.* It was by the ſecret Illuminations of the bleſſed Spirit, and nothing elſe, that our Lord's Apoſtles were enabled to diſcern the Hearts of Men; but this was not our Lord's Caſe altogether.

1 Cor. 12. 11.

They who denied that our Lord had Two diſtinct Wills ſuitable to the Two diſtinct Natures that were united in his Sacred Perſon, were branded with the Name of *Monothelites*, and condemned as Hereticks by a Council at *Rome* gathered by Pope *Martin* the Firſt in the Year 652, or, as ſome ſay, 650. And if it be Hereſie to deny a diſtinction of *Will* in our Saviour's Perſon, it muſt be reaſonable to allow a like diſtinction of *Underſtanding* too. As he was God,

God, his Underſtanding was *Infinite*: For, as *Aquinas* tells us, with God, *Eſſe & Intelligere idem ſunt*; His *Eſſence* and his *Underſtanding* are one and the ſame thing; ſo that the One being infinite, the other muſt be ſo too.

But our Lord's *Humane* Underſtanding was capable of ſeveral *degrees* and meaſures of Knowledge. Accordingly the Evangeliſt tells us, *Jeſus encreaſed in Wiſdom and Stature.* As his *Body* grew in *Age* and *Stature*, ſo his *Underſtanding* encreaſed in *Knowledge.* And we cannot doubt, but all that Knowledge, which might any way be uſeful to him in the diſpatch of that great Work for which he came, was by his *own Deity* communicated to his *Manhood.* One part of his Work was to inſtruct the World by his Doctrine and Example; but the moſt conſiderable part of his Buſineſs was to die. But leſt he might Luk. 2. 52.

have been ſurprized with Death before his time, and thereby ſome other parts of his Work might have been left undone; it was convenient for him to underſtand the Hearts, Intentions, and Deſigns of his Enemies, who ſought to kill him; and this he knew, conſidered as Man, by *Revelation.*

And, by the way, the Reaſon why our Lord's *Humane* Underſtanding was kept in ignorance touching the Day and Hour of the laſt Judgment, might well be this; namely, becauſe God Almighty did not ſee it *convenient*, but rather *prejudicial*, that the World ſhould be taught that Leſſon; and, upon that Score, our Lord, who in his Humane Nature was the *Teacher*, had no need, as ſuch, to know it.

But, that our Lord knew the hearts of Men by another ſort of Knowledge, beſides that by Revelation,

velation, ſeems evident from that expreſſion of the Evangeliſt, *Jeſus knew in himſelf*; not by the hearing of his Ear, not by any Information from other Men, no nor meerly by any Revelation from Heaven; but ἐν ἑαυτῷ; *In and by himſelf. Nemine indicante*, ſaith *Maldonate*; he knew the matter without any Intimations given him by any other hand. And from this Knowledge of his may we juſtly infer our Lord's Divinity; and to aſſure us of it did he at this time take occaſion to manifeſt his own Omniſcience; ſo ſaith *Theophylact*, who tells us, that our Lord ſpake ſome words there mention'd in the Context; θέλων δεῖξαι, ὅτι ὡς Θεὸν εἶδεν αὐτὸν λανθάνει τὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, being willing to ſhew that there is nothing in the hearts of Men concealed from him, as being *God*. But,

Joh. 6. 61.

Theophyl. in Joan. 6. 61.

2. 'Tis certain that our bleſſed Saviour foreſaw the future *Actions* of Men, and infallibly foreknew the

the future *Events* and Iſſues of things; even ſuch Events, as depended upon Cauſes, that were not *neceſſary* but *contingent* only.

Indeed, where Cauſes are *Natural* and *Neceſſary*, fixed and determined, *ad unum*. What their *Effects* yet *to come*, will certainly be, judicious and learned Men can eaſily foreſee. The Change, increaſe, full, and wane of the Moon, the Eclipſes of the Sun and the Moon, the riſing and ſetting of both at ſuch or ſuch an hour depending upon ſuch Cauſes, as cannot be interrupted by any Accident, are certainly foreknown by our skilfull Mathematicians. But where Cauſes are *Contingent*, ſuch as may be ſuſpended or croſſed in their Operations; where *Agents* are *free*, *ad utramlibet partem*, it being at their own *choice* to act or not to act thus or thus; what will be, or not be, is to the wiſeſt of Men altogether uncertain.

Such

Such a *Preſcience* as *this of future Events* is the peculiar Prerogative of God, and thereby, as by an Infallible Character, doth the Prophet diſtinguiſh the true God from falſe ones: *Let them ſhew us what ſhall happen, and declare us things to come; ſhew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are Gods.* This Text imports the truth of that, which *Tertullian* long ſince aſſerted; *Teſtimonium Divinitatis veritas divinationis*; The true *Prediction* of things to come, is a Teſtimony of *Divinity*. By this very Argument was God Almighty pleaſed to evidence the truth of his own Deity; *Behold, the former things are come to paſs, and new things do I declare; before they ſpring forth, I tell you of them.* 'Tis an Argument of his *Omniſcience*, and that is no where to be found, but in a God.

Eſa. 41. 22.

Tert. in Apolog. cap. 20. p. 18.

Eſa. 42. 9.

And the ground thereof is thus given us by *Aquinas*; *Contingentia infallibiliter a Deo cognoſcuntur, in quantum*

Aqu. 1. Par. qu. 14. Art. 12.

quantum ſubduntur Divino conſpectui ſecundùm ſuam Præſentialitatem: Future Contingencies are infallibly known to God, foraſmuch as they are preſent to him, and within his view. And again he tells us, *Quæcunque poſſunt per Creaturam fieri, vel cogitari, vel dici; & etiam quæcunque ipſe facere poteſt, omnia cognoſcit Deus, etiamſi Actu non ſint*: Whatſoever things can be done, thought, or ſaid by any Creature; whatſoever things God himſelf can do, though they are not yet in *Actual* being, God knoweth them all, *Scientia Viſionis*, by immediate *Viſion* and *Intuition*. To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks *Bellarmine*, *Deus intelligit res omnes, quæ quo quo modo eſſe poſſunt*: All things, whether in *preſent Exiſtence*, or but in a *Poſſibility* of future Being, are certainly known to God.

Ejuſdem qu. Art. 9.

Bellarm. de grat. & lib. Arb. l. 4 cap. 13.

And ſuch a Knowledge was there found in our bleſſed Saviour, who well knew, not only the *preſent Thoughts* of Men, but their *future Actions*

Actions too; the Treaſon of *Judas*, the time when, the place where, the Perſons by whom, and the manner how he ſhould ſuffer, and when he ſhould riſe again; all this he knew beforehand, and foretold his Apoſtles. That all his Diſciples ſhould forſake him, that *Peter* ſhould three times deny him; he was aware, and gave them warning of it.

Theſe and many other Teſtimonies of our Saviour's foreknowledge of things to come, have our Evangeliſts left us upon Record; ſo that we may confidently make the ſame Addreſs, and ſay to our Redeemer, as St. *Peter* did, *Lord, thou knoweſt All things*; and if ſo, he that is Omniſcient, is and muſt be God. It's true, the *Sun* is called *Oculus Mundi*, the *Eye* of the World; and it is ſaid, πάντ' ἐφορᾶν καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούειν, To ſee and hear all things: And for that Reaſon, as well as ſome other, it was thought and adored as if it had been

been a God that knew, πότε ὄντα πάντ' ἐσσόμενα, πρόσθ' ἐόντα, Things paſt, preſent, and to come. They who had entertained ſuch thoughts of the *Sun*, may be juſtly blamed for their groſs *Ignorance*; but upon their Suppoſition, they are excuſable for their *Adoration*. For that Being which hath πανεπίσκοπον ὄμμα, an All-ſeeing Eye, an Infinite and omniſcient Underſtanding, is God; and as ſuch muſt be worſhipped.

And the truth is, the grand Reaſon, why our Lord thought fit to foretell ſo many *future Events*, which depended upon *free Agents*, and meerly *contingent Cauſes*, was to declare his own Omniſcience, and thereby to prove himſelf to be, what indeed he was. To this end he told his Diſciples thus, *Now I tell you before it come, that when it is come to paſs, ye may believe that I am he:* What *He* doth he mean? What *He* could certainly foretell ſo many things

Joh. 13. 19.

to

to come? not a mere Man ſure; for, as St. *James* ſaith, *We know not what ſhall be on the morrow:* But then what means our Lord, when he ſaith, *That ye may believe that I am he?* *Maldonate* well anſwers thus, *Ut credatis me verum eſſe Chriſtum, non ſimulatum; verum Deum, qui res omnes, antequam eveniunt, perſpectas habeo, quod proprium eſt Divinitatis*; That ye may believe that I am not a *Counterfeit* Meſſias, but the *True* One; yea, and the *True* God too, who clearly do foreſee all things to come; and that's a Perfection *proper* and peculiar to a Deity. Jam. 4.14.

But if after all this our *Socinians* ſhall plead again, that our Lord foreſaw *future Events*, as *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* did, by *Revelation* only: I anſwer this is *Gratis dictum*, ſaid indeed, but can never be proved. But ſince it is proved by many other Arguments, which cannot be fairly anſwered, that our Lord is truly God, as well as truly

truly Man; we muſt conclude, That as he knew things to come by *Revelation*, conſidered as *Man*; even ſo, conſidered as *God*, he knew all things, *Intuitivè*, by his own immediate Inſpection, and Intuition. But,

3. My Third and laſt Argument to prove our Lord's Divinity ſhall be this; That bleſſed Perſon, who is *Omnipreſent*, Immenſe, and Infinite, is truly God. But our Lord is ſuch a Perſon.

There is no Creature capable of being ſo; for all created *Spirits* are in ſome one certain place, *definitivè*, they are determined and limited; and all Corporeal Beings are in one certain place, *Circumſcriptivè*, they are bounded and circumſcribed; 'tis the Prerogative of God alone to be *every where at once*. For, as his *Eternity* is *coexiſtent* with all Succeſſions of *Time*, ſo is his *Immenſity commenſurate* with all diſtances of places, wherein

wherein he is *Repletivè*, *per Eſſentiam*, *Potentiam*, & *Præſentiam*, by his Eſſence, Power, and Preſence, as the *Schoolmen* ſpeak.

And the certainty of this Divine *Ubiquity* we may learn from that demand of God mentioned by the Prophet, *Can any hide himſelf in ſecret places, that I ſhall not ſee him, ſaith the Lord? Do not I fill Heaven and Earth, ſaith the Lord?* This Queſtion the *Pſalmiſt* thus reſolves, *If I aſcend up into Heaven, thou art there; if I make my Bed in Hell, behold thou art there*, &c. by theſe and ſome other Expreſſions doth the *Pſalmiſt* aſſert God's Omnipreſence; and that's a thing, *Quod Divinitatis proprium eſt.* Peculiar to a *Deity*: So ſpeaks St. *Ambroſe*, cited by *Aquinas*.

Jer. 23. 24

Pſ. 139. 8.

Aquin. 1. par. qu 8. Art. 4.

And thus it was with our bleſſed Saviour, even whilſt he converſed here below; for though his *Humane Nature* then was, and ſtill is, contrary to the Opinion

of the *Ubiquitaries* and the *Roman Church*, confined to, and contained in *one* certain place; yet his *whole* Perſon never was, never will be ſo. See that Speech of his to *Nathanael*, *I ſaw thee under the Fig-tree*: How ſo? Surely not with his bodily Eyes; for our Lord was then preſent in one place, and *Nathanael* at too great a diſtance in another; and yet ſaith our Lord, *I ſaw thee*, Μὴ παρὼν ἐγίνωσκε, ſaith *Theophylact*; though our Lord, as to his Humane Nature, was remote from *Philip* and *Nathanael*, yet he *ſaw* their *Perſons*, and *heard* their *Diſcourſes*, and thereby he did, Ἀποκαλύπτειν τὴν ἰδίαν θεότητα, He gave them an early intimation of his own *Divinity*, and that by his *Omnipreſence*, and *Omniſcience*.

Joh. 1. 48.

And this Truth receives a farther and undeniable Confirmation by that Speech of Chriſt to *Nicodemus*; *No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from*

Joh. 3. 13.

from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven. 'Tis a ſtrange thing that any Man who believes theſe Words of Chriſt, which do ſo clearly import his *Omnipreſence*, ſhould deny, or doubt of his *Divinity*; for he was now diſcourſing with *Nicodemus* here on *Earth*; and yet he calls himſelf the Son of Man, ὁ ὢν which *is*, now *is*, in Heaven. But how ſo? not as *Man*: for 'tis impoſſible for any Man, as ſuch, to be at the ſame time on *Earth*, and in *Heaven* too. No, we muſt grant that he was, as *Theophylact* words it, on *Earth*, σωματικῶς, in regard of his *Corporeal* Preſence; but in *Heaven*, θεϊκῶς, in reſpect of his *Divinity*; on Earth as *Man*; in Heaven as *God*.

There is yet one Text more, which I ſhall uſe to prove the ſame Truth; I mean that Promiſe which our Lord gave his Apoſtles immediately before his Aſcenſion up to Heaven; *Loe, I am with you al-* Mat. 28. 20

way, even to the end of the World: But how could that be? He was now removing his *Humane* Nature up to *Heaven*; his Apoſtles by his Command were to go into *all* the World, and to preach the Goſpel, one in this Kingdom, and another in that: And ſince our Lord himſelf was to be in Heaven, and his Apoſtles were to be ſeparated, diſperſed, and ſcattered abroad throughout the whole Earth, how could this Promiſe be made good, *I am with you*, with *every* one of you, and that *alway*, at *all Times*, and in *all Places?* Certainly this Promiſe could not have been performed, were not our Lord *Omnipreſent*, and he that is ſo, is and muſt be truly God.

And thus by theſe Three Attributes, *Omnipotence*, *Omniſcience*, and *Omnipreſence*, which the Scriptures do aſcribe to our bleſſed Saviour, and which are *peculiar* to *God* alone, I have endeavoured to confirm the certainty of his *Di-*

Divinity; which I might have proved by ſome other Arguments, had I not thought it needleſs; for he that will not be convinced by theſe, will be convinced by none.

3. My Third and laſt Work is to prove the Divinity of the bleſſed Spirit, who is the Third Perſon in the Glorious Godhead.

What various Opinions have been entertained about this bleſſed Spirit, we learn from ſeveral Authors: *Gregory Nazianzen* tells us, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον Σαδδουκαῖοι οὐ δὲ εἶ τὸ παράπαν ἐνόμιζαν. So ſpeaks St. *Auſtin*, *Sadducæi Spiritum Sanctum negabant*, The *Sadducees* did utterly deny, that there is any ſuch being as the Spirit. And what do the *Sabellians* leſs? For of them St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Spiritum prorſus ita negant, ut ipſum Deum negent Trinitatem eſſe, ſed tantummodo eſſe Deum Patrem aſſeverant,*

Greg. Naz. Or. 37. p. 595.

Aug. de ver. Dom. Ser. 11. f. 10. p. 9.

& ipſum aliquando vocari filium, aliquando vocari Spiritum Sanctum; They do ſo far deny the Spirit, as to deny the *Trinity*, affirming, that the *Father* alone is God; and that *He it is* who is ſometimes called the *Son*, and ſometimes the *Spirit*, as if they were not diſtinct *Perſons*, but only different *Names*.

St. *Auſtin* tells us again, That the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, and *Macedonians*, allow the *Spirit* to be a *Perſon*; but, *Non Creatorem, ſed Creaturam*, not the *Creator*, but a *Creature*, Μονογενῆς ποίημα· So *Eunomius* in St. *Baſil*, ſtyles him; as if he were created by our Lord; and as being ſuch, that Heretick looked upon him, as the ſame Father writes, ὡς ὄργανον καὶ ὑπήκοον, καὶ ὁμὸ τιμὴν τῇ κτίσει, καὶ ἡμῖν ὁμόδουλον, as an *Inſtrument*, a *Subject*, of the ſame rank with other Creatures, and our *Fellow-ſervant*. And amongſt many other Errors with which *Origen* ſtands charged, this is one; namely, that he ſtyled the Son

Baſil. M. adv. Eunom. l. 2. p. 76.

Baſil. M. de Sp. S. cap. 19. p. 194.

Huetius Origen. l. 2. c. 13.

Son and the Spirit, λειτουργικὰ ζῶα, Miniſtring Creatures. Againſt the Men of this Opinion *Gregory Nazianzen* doth thus declaim, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον οἱ μὲ εἰς κτίσμα καταγοντες, ὑβρισταὶ, καὶ δοῦλοι κακοὶ, καὶ κακῶν κακιστοὶ· They who *degrade* the Holy Spirit of God, and make him but a *Creature*, are Blaſphemers, evil Servants, and of all evil ones the worſt. Naz. Or. 44. p. 709.

But beſides theſe bolder Hereticks, there were ſome others, who did not think the *Holy Spirit* to be a mere *Creature*, but, as *Nazianzen* tells us, ἐνέργειαν, the *Vertue* and Efficacy and operative Power of God. But ſome there were yet more kind, who allowed to the Spirit ſome *Share* of the *Divine Nature*, and thought him a *God*; but, as *Gregory Nyſſen* ſaith, οὐ τῷ ὑῷ ἐξισούμενον, not equal to the Son. There is yet another ſort of Men, of whom *Nazianzen* ſaith, ὅτε σέβουσιν, ὅτε ἀτιμάζουσι, They do neither *diſhonour* the Spirit, nor *adore* him, Naz. Or. 37. p. 595. Greg. Nyſ. adv. Eunom. p. 63. Naz. Or. 37. p. 595.

as being uncertain, whether he be a Creature or a God.

These ill Opinions being once raised, were much advanced by the Writings of *Origen*, being a Person of great Learning and Reputation; of whom 'tis said, *Ubi bene, nemo melius; ubi male, nemo pejus*; When he wrote *well*, no Man wrote *better*; but when *ill*, no Man *worse*. Nay, these ill Opinions do still receive some Countenance from the Writings of such Men as were *Orthodox* in their Judgments, but too *unwary* in some Expressions. 'Tis well known that *Athanasius* was the prime Defender of the Truth, professed by the *Nicene* Council against the *Arians*; and yet even he hath left some Lines behind him, which are interpreted and do seem to favour that Opinion, which he himself condemned; for, speaking of our Lord and his Holy Spirit, he saith that our Lord shewed himself to be, ἐλάτ-

Athanas. adv. Arianos Or. 2. p. 357.

ἐλάττονα τῦ πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ μείζονα καὶ ἴσον, No way *inferiour* to the Spirit, but *greater* than He, and equal to him. This Expreſſion ſeems inconſiſtent with it ſelf, and repugnant to the Judgment of this great Man, who wrote it. And truly he muſt be a very candid and favourable Interpreter, who will excuſe great St. *Baſil* for ſaying thus, τὸ πνεῦμα δευτερεύειν τῦ υἱῦ ἀξιώματι οὐ προδίδωσιν ἴσως ὁ τῆς Εὐσεβείας λόγος. Nor do I think that Expreſſion of *Tertullian*, if well weighed, to be juſtifiable, wherein the bleſſed Spirit of God is ſtyled, *Tertius Majeſtatis gradus*: As if there were any Inequality, βαθμοὶ καὶ ὑποβαθμοὶ, higher and lower degrees in thoſe eſſential Excellencies, which are inſeparable from each of thoſe Three glorious Perſons, of whom *Nazianzen* doth thus affirm, τὸ πνεῦμα μετὰ πατρὸς καὶ υἱῦ ὁμόσπορον καὶ ὁμότιμον, The Spirit is of the ſelf-ſame Subſtance, and of *equal* Honour with the Father and

Baſil. M. adv. Eun. l. 3. p. 78.

Tertul. adv. Praxean, p. 558.

Nazianz. Or. 20. p. 365.

and the Son. The ſame thing intimates *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, or he who bears that Name: Ὅσα ἔξεστι τῷ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τῷ θεαρχικῷ πνεύματι ἀνατίθησι γραφή; The Scripture doth aſcribe to the Divine *Spirit* whatever eſſential Perfections do belong either to the *Father* or to the *Son*, their natural Excellencies being equal. And that the bleſſed Spirit is truly God, equal with the Father and the Son, I ſhall now endeavour to prove by theſe following Arguments.

Diony. Ar. de div. nom. p. 167.

1. That the bleſſed Spirit is truly God, hath been in all Ages the general Belief and common Profeſſion of the moſt Pious, Learned, and Judicious Perſons, who were as converſant in, and as well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, which are the only Rules and Grounds of Divine Faith, as any mortal Man can ever hope to be.

To prove the Being of a God againſt our Modern Atheiſts, one Ar-

Argument commonly uſed, is drawn from the general conſent of Nations; and to prove that this bleſſed Spirit is that God, we may raiſe an Argument from the general conſent of the Catholick Church. Our common Belief, that there is a God, ariſeth from the Diſcourſes and Inferences of Humane Reaſon, concluding the neceſſity of ſuch a Divine Being from the viſible Works of Creation and Providence; and our common belief, That the bleſſed Spirit is God, doth ariſe from the Teſtimony of thoſe Sacred Oracles, which being well underſtood, and rightly apprehended by the Reaſon of Man, are infallible, and cannot fail us. And as we do not doubt the *Being* of a God, becauſe ſome *Atheiſts*, contrary to the united Sentiments of all Mankind beſides, have denied it; ſo neither ſhould we doubt the *Divinity* of the bleſſed Spirit, becauſe ſome *Hereticks*, contrary to the joynt

joynt Suffrages of the Univerſal Church, have made bold to oppoſe it.

What hath been, and ſtill is, the belief of the Catholick Church concerning the bleſſed *Spirit*, we learn from thoſe ſeveral *Creeds* and Publick Confeſſions of Faith, which have been, and ſtill are, generally received and owned, as ſhort Abridgments of all thoſe Doctrines of Faith, which are delivered more largely in the Holy Scriptures, and are neceſſary to Man's Salvation. The firſt of theſe *Creeds* is that, which bears the Name of our Lord's *Apoſtles*, as being compiled either by *themſelves* before their diſperſion, or elſe collected out of their *Writings*, to be a ſtanding Rule of Faith, by other Apoſtolical Men, who were their Immediate Succeſſors.

This moſt Ancient *Creed*, as to the bleſſed Spirit, ſaith no more than this; πιςεύω εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*: and

and with this Article ſome Creeds ended, but none did omit it; no not that, which *Arius* himſelf delivered to that famous Emperour *Conſtantine* the Great, and that with this ſolemn Proteſtation; Ταύτην τὴν παρειλήφαμεν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίων Εὐαγγελίων, λέγοντος τοῦ κυρίου τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· Εἰ μὴ ταῦτα ἔστω πιστεύομεν, καὶ παραδεχόμεθα ἀληθῶς, πατέρα, υἱὸν, καὶ πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ὡς πᾶσα καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ διδάσκουσιν, αἷς κατὰ πάντα πιστεύομεν, κριτὴς ἡμῶν ὄντα ὁ θεὸς, καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ κρίσει. We have received this Faith from the Holy Goſpels, our Lord ſaying to his Diſciples, *Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* If we do not thus believe, if we do not truly acknowledge the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*, as the whole Catholick

Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. c. 26.

Mat. 28. 19.

lick Church, and the Scriptures, to which we aſſent in all things, do teach us, God is our Judge at preſent, and will be ſo, when the great Day comes. This Proteſtation of *Arius* and his Friend *Euzoius* was ſo Solemn, that *Sozomen* ſaith, ὅρκον ὤμοσεν; he ſware an Oath, That without any *Equivocation* he did heartily believe all the Articles contained in that *Creed*, whereof that, which relates to the bleſſed *Spirit* was one.

Sozom. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 2. c. 27.

And certainly this general profeſſion of Faith in the *Holy Spirit*, contained in the *Apoſtles Creed*, is an undeniable Evidence, that the whole *Catholick Church* did ſuppoſe and verily believe him to be *truly God*, Equal to the *Father* and the *Son*. True it is, were not the bleſſed *Spirit* truly God, the belief of all Mankind could not make him ſo; but ſuch a Faith is a ſtrong Argument, that all they, who believe in him, do judge and conclude, that he certainly is a *God* indeed.

indeed. So argued that great Divine *Gregory Nazianzen*, who mentioning this bleſſed Spirit, writes thus: εἰ μὲν κτίσμα, πῶς εἰς αὐτὸ πιστεύομεν; If the *Spirit* be a *Creature*, how come we to *believe* in him? τὸ γὰρ ὅτι Θεότητος, To be thus believed on, is a thing peculiar unto God. So that the profeſſion of this Article, as it is barely ſet down in the Apoſtles Creed, *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, without any further Illuſtrations, was thought enough to ſhew the belief of the *Catholick Church*, that this bleſſed Spirit is really *God*. For when we ſay, *We believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, we do it, εἰς μίαν ἕνωσιν Θεότητος, καὶ μίαν ὁμοουσιότητα, ſaith *Epiphanius*, we profeſs our Faith in the *Holy Spirit* to ſhew our belief that he is *One God*, one and the ſame Individual Subſtance with the *Father* and the *Son*.

Nazianz. Orat. 37. pag. 596.

Epiphan. Hær. 74.

And that this was the known Faith of the *Catholick Church*, and whence they received it, we learn from

from *Irenæus*, whoſe words are theſe; Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 1. cap. 2. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα, καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, πίστιν, &c. The Church, though diſperſed throughout the World, received from the *Apoſtles* and their Diſciples their Faith in *One God* the *Father*, and in *One Chriſt*, and in the *Holy Ghoſt*; τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, &c. who by the Prophets preached and foretold the whole *Oeconomy* of the Goſpel.

Which words being added to the *Apoſtles Creed*, I mean to that particular Article which relates to the bleſſed *Spirit*, do infallibly prove his *Divinity*. And for this very end, 'tis thought, that one Clauſe like this of *Irenæus*, and ſome other, in oppoſition to the *Hereſie* of *Macedonius*, were added to the *Nicene Creed* by the ſecond *General Council*, gathered by *Theodoſius* at *Con-*

Conſtantinople; where (though ſome think it was done by the *Nicene Council* it ſelf) this Article of the *Apoſtles Creed* was thus enlarged: Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν; I believe in the *Holy Ghoſt*, the *Lord* and giver of Life, who proceedeth from the *Father*, who together with the *Father* and the *Son* is *worſhipped* and glorified, who ſpake by the Prophets. Of this Creed thus enlarged in this and other Articles, *Epiphanius*, cited by the late learned *Archbiſhop Uſher*, gives this high Commendation; Αὕτη μὲν ἡ πίστις παρεδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων; The Doctrines of Faith contained in this Creed were delivered by the Holy Apoſtles. Uſſerius Archiep. Armach. de Symbolis.

And theſe enlargements were not added to the *Apoſtles Creed*, as if that had been judged *inſufficient*; but it was thought fit to *explain*,

amplifie, and illuſtrate thoſe Articles eſpecially, which relate to the Perſon of our bleſſed Saviour, and his Holy Spirit; our Lord's Divinity being denied by the *Arians*, and the Deity of the *Holy Ghoſt* being as ſtiffly oppoſed by the *Macedonians*. Of theſe later, Ὡς πνευματομάχων, *Epiphanius* writes thus; Εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ τὸ Ἅγιον ὅτι βλασφημοῦσι, μὴ συναριθμοῦντες αὐτὸ Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ ἐν τῇ θεότητι. The ſame thing is teſtified by *Socrates* of *Macedonius* himſelf; Τὸ Ἅγιον πνεῦμα συναναγαβεῖν εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν τῆς τριάδος ἐξέκλινε. He and his followers refuſed to number and reckon the Holy *Spirit* with the *Father* and the *Son*; *Eum eſſe Creaturam dicentes*, ſaying that he is a *Creature*. So writes St. *Auſtin*. Ἀλλότριον τῆς θεότητος; They thought him to be, as to the Divine Nature, a perfect Stranger. So ſaith the ſecond General *Council* of *Conſtantinople*, as *Balſamon* expounds it. And by this Council

Epiphan. Har. 74. Sect. 1.

Socra Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. cap. 45. p. 159.

Auguſt. de Hæreſ. Tom. 6. pag. 6.

Concil. Conſtanti. Can. 1.

Council was *Macedonius* and his followers branded with the name of *Semi-Arians*, and accordingly *Anathematized* as *Hereticks*.

And certainly thoſe ſevere Cenſures, which were paſſed by the Governours of the Primitive Church againſt all thoſe who denied the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, are undeniable Evidences, that they themſelves did own it as a neceſſary and undoubted Article of the Chriſtian Faith. And this Faith of theirs they did not only *profeſs* in *Words*, but they did *ſecond* and confirm it by their *Practice* too. For, in their Solemn Acts of Religious Worſhip, Doxologies, and Supplications, they were wont to make their humble Addreſſes, as well to the *Holy Spirit*, as to the *Father* and the *Son*. So did *Gregory Nazianzene*, Παρέστω μοὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ διδότω λόγον, ὅσον καὶ βούλομαι· Ἐι δὲ μὴ τοσοῦτον, ἀλλ' ὅσος γὲ τῷ καιρῷ σύμμετρος; Let the Spirit be pre- Nazianz. Or. 44. p. 709.

ſent with me, and grant me as great a faculty to ſpeak, as I can wiſh; but if not ſo, yet as much as ſutes the occaſion. And thus he prayeth elſewhere to the whole Trinity, Ἀλλὰ Πάτερ, Πατρὸς ὁ Λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα φαεινὸν, Μή με λίπῃς; But thou, O *Father*, and thou, O *Word* of the Father, and thou, O Glorious *Spirit*, forſake me not. Thus alſo prayed St. *Cyprian* to the *Spirit* alone by name, *Adeſto, Sancte Spiritus, & Paracleſim tuam expectantibus illabere cælitùs, Sanctifica Templum corporis noſtri, &c.* Be preſent, O Holy *Spirit*, and from Heaven inſpire and influence thoſe, who wait for thy Conſolation, Sanctifie the Temple of our Body, *&c.*

Nazianz. Carm. 5. p. 72.

Cypr. de Sp. Sancto, p. 345.

Nor did the Primitive Chriſtians direct their *Petitions* only, but alſo their *Doxologies* and Thanksgivings to the Holy *Spirit* as well as to the *Father* and the *Son*; there is one cited by St. *Baſil* out of *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, which runs thus;

thus; Τῷ θεῷ, καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν Αἰώνων, Ἀμήν: To God the *Father*, and the *Son* our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy *Spirit*, be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever, *Amen*. This *Doxology* St. *Basil* styles, Ἀρχαίαν τὴν φωνήν, and speaks of it thus, Οὐδενὶ πώποτε ἀσεβεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν οἱ λέγοντες· Αἰνοῦμεν πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα θεοῦ; Never were they thought to be guilty of Impiety, who said, We praise the *Father*, and the *Son*, and the Holy *Spirit* of God.

Basil. de Sp. Sancto, cap. 29. p. 218.

Basil. cap. eodem. p. 220.

Now then, if the Ancient Fathers, who were Men of great Abilities, signal Industry, and exemplary Piety; who searched the Scriptures to the utmost of their power, and in so doing earnestly begged and doubtless found the assistances of Heaven; if such Men as these, after their devout Petitions and strictest scrutiny into such

and ſuch Texts, found cauſe to believe the *Divinity* of the *Holy Spirit*, and did accordingly perform *Religious Services* to him, methinks their *Faith* and *Practice* ſhould be a very great Inducement to us to believe his *Godhead*.

For, 'tis not reaſonable to think, that the Divine Providence ſhould permit ſuch great numbers of the moſt learned and pious Men, who were the Pillars of the Catholick Church, to lie under ſuch a groſs Miſtake in a matter of ſuch great Importance, as muſt needs lead themſelves into an Idolatrous Worſhip, and by their Example and Writings tranſmit the ſame to all ſucceeding Ages. 'Tis a Suppoſition, I think, not reconcilable to ſeveral Promiſes; our Lord told his Apoſtles, *The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth.* And if it be ſuppoſed that this Promiſe was *Perſonal*, and concern'd none but the *Apoſtles* only; yet there is another, which relates to the

Joh. 16. 13.

Church

Church in general; for, ſaith our Lord, *The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it:* nay, there is a Promiſe, which reacheth *every* good Man in particular; *If any Man will do his Will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God:* Theſe and the like Promiſes being conſidered as to their *Matter*, and acknowledged as to their *Truth*, 'tis not imaginable, that the Divine Providence and Goodneſs ſhould permit the *Catholick Church*, and the choiceſt Members of it, and that from Age to Age, to lie under ſo great a Miſtake, as to believe the bleſſed *Spirit* to be truly God, and to *worſhip* him as ſuch, if he were not ſo indeed.

Mat. 16. 18.

Joh. 7. 17.

I conclude this Argument with the Teſtimony of *Hildebert*, Archbiſhop of *Tours*, and an excellent Poet, who, in a very elegant *Hymn* touching the glorious Trinity, writes thus concerning the bleſſed *Spirit*.

Paracletus increatus, neq; factus neq; natus,
Patri compar filioq; ſic procedit ab utroq;
Ne ſit minor Poteſtate, vel diſcretus qualitate:
Quanti Illi, tantus iſte; Quales Illi, Talis Iſte;
Ex quo Illi, tantus iſte; ſemper Illi, ſemper Iſte;
Quiſq; trium plenus Deus; non tres tamen Dii, ſed Deus.

2. My ſecond Argument to prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit ſhall be this: That bleſſed Perſon, who doth *regenerate*, quicken, revive, and ſanctifie the Soul of Man, is God. But the Holy Spirit is that bleſſed Perſon, who doth regenerate, quicken, revive, and ſanctifie the Soul of Man.

St. *Paul* told his Converts at
Eph. 2. 1. *Epheſus*, *Ye were dead in Sins and Treſpaſſes*; That by Nature is the common Caſe of all Mankind; and

and for that Reaſon our Lord hath ſaid, *ye muſt be born again*: But, as *Nicodemus* replied, *How can a Man be born again?* Certainly 'tis a Work which requires an Almighty Power, it muſt be the Work of an Omnipotent God. True it is, St. *Paul* told his Converts at *Corinth*, *I have begotten you through the Goſpel*: I, as an *Inſtrument*, in and by the uſe of the Goſpel as the *Means*, but ſtill the *Principal Agent* in this great Work, without whom *Paul* and the Goſpel could have done no good, was *God*. So he told the Saints at *Epheſus*; *And you hath he quickned, who were dead in Sins*: Not *I*, not the *Goſpel*, but *He*, *i.* God. So St. *James*, *Of his own Will he begat us*. And for this Reaſon, the regenerate Perſon is ſaid to be *born of God*, a Child, a Son, an Heir of God.

Joh. 3. 7.

1 Cor. 4. 15.

Eph. 2. 1.

Jam. 1. 18.

And as every good Man's new Birth or Regeneration is aſcribed to *God*, ſo more particularly is it aſcri-

aſcribed to the *Spirit*; he that is ſaid to be *born of God* in one place, is ſaid to be born of the Spirit in another; ſo ſpeaks our bleſſed Sa-
Joh. 3. 5, 6. viour, *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit*, &c. And
Joh. 6. 63. again, *That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.* And yet again, *It is the Spirit that quickneth.* So
1 Cor. 6. 11 Intimates St. *Paul*, *Ye are ſanctified by the Spirit of our God.* And ſo
Tit. 3. 5. again. *He ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* Such Texts as theſe
Greg. Nyſ. adv. Eunom. Or. 1 p. 60. gave juſt occaſion to *Gregory Nyſſen* to ſay of the Scripture, Διαῤῥήδην μαρτυρεῖ τῷ Ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τῶν τῷ θεῷ τέκνων τὴν γέννησιν. It doth in expreſs Words teſtifie, That the Regeneration of the Children of God is the proper Work of the Holy
Cyril. Hieroſol. in Catech. 16. p. 176. *Spirit*; whom St. *Cyril* upon the ſame account ſtyles τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγραμμένων ἁπάντων ἁγιαστὴν, the Sanctifier of all God's Elect; and then he adds, τοῦτο φωτίζει τὰς ψυχὰς τὸ δικαίων, 'Tis the *Spirit* which illu-

illuminates all Righteous Men's Souls.

Now from this Supernatural Work of Man's Regeneration we may juſtly inferr the *Divinity* of the *Holy Spirit*, and conclude, as *Gregory Nyſſen* doth, οἱ λαβόντες ἐξουσίαν τοῦ τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, μαρτυροῦσι τῷ πνεύματι τὴν θεότητα. They who have received the Privilege of being made the Children of God, do, by their very being ſo, teſtifie the *Divinity* of his *Spirit*. For ſince Man's Regeneration is the undoubted Work of *God*, and yet the proper Work of the *Spirit*; it muſt follow by an undeniable Conſequence, that the Spirit is God indeed. Greg. Nyſ. adv. Eunom. Or. 1. p. 59.

3. My third Argument to prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit ſhall be this: If the Scriptures be the Word of God, then is the Holy Spirit God. But the Scriptures certainly are the Word of God.

The

The Divinity of the Holy Scriptures, did our *Socinians* deny the Authority of the *whole* Bible, as they do that of ſome *particular* Texts, might be proved from a great variety of proper *Topicks*. The punctual *accompliſhment* of its *Prophecies*, ſuch as foretold *future Contingencies* at the greateſt diſtances of time; even ſuch Events as were exceedingly *improbable*; nay ſome Events as were, according to the common courſe of Nature, utterly *impoſſible*: Such were our Lord's Birth from a Virgin, and his Reſurrection from the dead. Beſides, the incomparable Excellence of Scripture *Precepts* far tranſcending the choiceſt Rules of the beſt ancient Moraliſts; the ſtupendious *Miracles*, which were often wrought by our Lord himſelf, by his Prophets and Apoſtles, purpoſely to confirm their Doctrine; the undaunted *Courage* and matchleſs *Patience* of the *Martyrs*, who ſuffered the greateſt

greateſt Tortures which Men or Devils could invent, for the Profeſſion, and in the defence of Scripture-Truths; it's wonderful *Preſervation* from Age to Age againſt the *Swords* of powerful *Tyrants*, and the *Pens* of ſubtle *Hereticks*; its mighty *Effects* and Influence upon the moſt obſtinate Hearts of Men; each of theſe, together with the conſtant *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*, and the frequent *Teſtimonies* of the Scripture it ſelf, might be managed as an Argument to confirm its Divine Authority.

But there is one Argument more, which alone would be ſufficient; and this it is: The Scripture cannot proceed from *Men* or *Angels*, whether good or bad; for as to *religious* Men, and *Holy* Angels, it were utterly inconſiſtent with their Goodneſs to forge and counterfeit ſuch and ſuch Records, and then to father them upon God, and impoſe them upon

on the World, as the Oracles of Heaven: And as for *wicked* Men and wicked Angels, the Scriptures cannot with any ſhew of Reaſon be imputed unto them, beauſe they croſs their deſigns, contradict their Inclinations, forbid what they love, command what they hate, condemn their Practices, and ſentence their Perſons to everlaſting Flames. Now, if the Scriptures came not from *Men* or *Angels*, they muſt come from *God*; for no other Author of them can poſſibly be imagined.

Now, if the Scriptures be, as moſt certainly they are, the *Word* of *God*, then may we thence infallibly conclude, that the Holy *Spirit* is *God*, becauſe to him, as their immediate and undoubted *Author*, the Scriptures are once and again entituled. St. *Luke* tells us,

Luk. 1. 70. *God ſpake by the Mouth of his holy Prophets*: And St. *Paul* ſaith, *All*

2 Tim. 3. 16. *Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God*;

God; but was it by the Inſpiration of God the *Father*, or God the *Son?* St. *Paul* anſwers, *Well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by Eſaias the Prophet.* And again, *Holy Men ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.* So St. *Peter.* And hence St. *Baſil* ſaith, That the Apoſtle ſtyles the Scripture, Θεοπνευστον, διὰ τ ἐπιπνοίας τ̃ ̃ Ἁγίε πνεύματος συγγεγραφῆσαν, Inſpired of *God*, becauſe it was written by the Inſpiration of the *Holy Spirit*; and hence *Irenæus* concludes the *Perfection* of the Scriptures; for thus he writes, *Scripturæ quidem perfectæ ſunt, quippe à Spiritu Dei dictæ*; the Scriptures are perfect indeed, becauſe dictated by the *Spirit* of God. So then, ſince the Scriptures are the *Word* of *God*, and withall the *Word* of the *Spirit*, this Conſequence is undeniable; namely, That this bleſſed *Spirit*, being the immediate Author of the Holy Scriptures, is and muſt be God.

Act. 28. 25.

2 Pet. 1. 21.

Baſil M. de Sp. Sancto, c. 21. p. 198.

Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 2. c. 47.

4. My

4. My fourth Argument, and the laſt which I ſhall or need uſe, to prove the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, ſhall be this: If our bleſſed Saviour, in reſpect of his *Humane Nature*, be indeed the *Son* of *God*, then is the Holy *Spirit* God. But moſt certain it is, that our bleſſed Saviour, in reſpect of his Humane Nature, is indeed the Son of God.

I do not read of any one Perſon throughout the whole Goſpel, that ever called our bleſſed Saviour *Son of Man*, but he was pleaſed frequently ſo to ſtyle himſelf; nay he ſtyles himſelf *the Son*, not τ ἀνθρώπε, but in the *Maſculine* Gender, τῦ ἀνθρώπε, a Title, from which ſome *Hereticks* took occaſion to ſay, That *Joſeph* was, not his *ſuppoſed*, but his *real* Father. But, the truth is, that as our Lord, in reſpect of his Divinity, was ἀμήτωρ, without a *Mother*; ſo in reſpect of his

his *Humanity*, he was, as to Men, ἀπάτωρ, without a Father. And yet notwithſtanding this, he might well be called *The Son of Man*, as he was the Son, *i.* one of the *Poſterity* of *David* and *Abraham*, who were *Men*, and from whom his Virgin *Mother* was lineally deſcended.

But as our Lord did frequently call himſelf, *The Son of Man*, ſo did he many times ſtyle himſelf, *The Son of God* too. And the Son of God he was and is, in reſpect of his *Deity*, by an eternal and neceſſary *Generation*; and, in reſpect of his *Humanity*, by a voluntary and miraculous *Conception* and *Birth*, in the fulneſs of time. His Sonſhip to God by an eternal Generation our *Socinians* will not grant; but his Sonſhip to God in regard of his wonderful *Incarnation*, I think, they do not deny.

Now, if it be granted, as indeed it ought to be, that our Lord is indeed the *Son* of *God* in reſpect of his *Humane Nature*, it muſt alſo be granted, that the Holy *Spirit* is *God*; for to him, as its undoubted *Author*, is the Humane Nature of Chriſt aſcribed. When *Joſeph* was minded to put away his Wife, as being then with
Mat. 1. 20. Child, but not by him, an *Angel* was ſent to tell him thus, *That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghoſt:* And that it ſhould be ſo, the Angel *Gabriel*, ſtyled *Angelus Miſericordiæ*, The Angel of *Mercy*, had foretold his Mother before her Conception; *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon Thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow Thee:* And what
Luk. 1. 35. then? *Therefore alſo that Holy thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God.* From hence it is evident, that our Lord, as *Man*, is the *Son* of *God*, becauſe

cauſe his whole Humane Nature was framed by the Inviſible Power and operation of the *Holy Ghoſt*; who, for that very reaſon, if the Angel's Inference have any thing of Truth and Pertinence in it, is and muſt be acknowledged God.

And thus have I endeavoured to prove the *Deity* of the *Holy Spirit* by four Arguments; Firſt, by the general belief of the Catholick Church, conſiſting of ſuch great numbers of pious and learned Men, ſo well acquainted with the word of God, and ſo well qualified for the aſſiſtances of Heaven, that we cannot piouſly or charitably imagine, that after all their indefatigable induſtry in ſearching the Scriptures, and their dayly Petitions to God for the Illuminations of his Holy Spirit, they ſhould ſtill be miſtaken from Age to Age in ſuch an Important Article of our Creed. Secondly, By the work of Grace or Rege-

neration; by vertue whereof every Sanctified Soul is ſaid to be born of God, becauſe born of the Spirit. Thirdly, By the Divine Authority of the Holy Scripture, which is therefore the word of God, becauſe it was dictated to the Prophets, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles, by the Immediate Inſpirations of the Holy Ghoſt. Fourthly, By our bleſſed Saviour's being the Son of God in reſpect of his Manhood; his Soul being immediately created, and his Body miraculouſly framed of his Mothers Subſtance, being firſt perfectly Sanctified by the powerful Operation of the Holy Spirit.

But to elude all Arguments drawn from thoſe Divine *Operations*, which the Scriptures attribute to the *Holy Spirit*, and whereby we prove his *Deity*; our *Socinians* affirm that he is no *Perſon*: So thought *Socinus* himſelf, who made bold to ſay, *Credo me ſatis oſtendiſſe*

oſtendiſſe Spiritum Sanctum non eſſe Perſonam, I believe that I have ſufficiently ſhewed that the Holy Spirit is not a Perſon; but what is he then? *Virtus Dei vel efficacia*, He is the *Vertue*, Power, or Efficacy of God, and no more: ſo He.

To this Heretical Opinion of *Socinus* we might oppoſe the ſounder judgments and vaſt numbers of learned Men. *Nazianzen* ſpeaking of God, ſaith that he is ἓν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, τὰ δὲ τρία τοῖς ὑποστάσεσι, *One* in *Subſtance*, but *Three* in *Perſons*. *Gregory Nyſſen* ſtyles Baptiſm, Μυστήριον τῶν τελείων ἁγίων ὑποστάσεων, The Myſtery of the *Three* Holy *Perſons*. *Theophylact* mentioning the Inſtitution and Form of Baptiſm, ſaith, τριῶν προσώπων ἐμνήσθη ὁ κύριος, Our Lord made mention of *Three Perſons*: And as to the bleſſed *Spirit* in particular, St. *Cyril* proves him to be a Perſon thus, ζῇ γάρ, καὶ λογικόν ἐστι,

Nazianz. Or. 32. p. 520.

Nyſſen. in Bapt. Chriſti, p. 804.

Cyr. Hier. Cat. 16. p. 176.

ζῇ, He lives, and is an *Intelligent* Being. And, to name no more, *Elias Cretenſis* writes thus of the *Holy Ghoſt*, *Spiritus eſt Eſſentia, quæ per ſe in peculiari Hypoſtaſi conſideratur*, The Spirit is an Eſſence, conſidered in a *Subſiſtence* peculiar to himſelf.

Elias Cret. in Naz. Or. 1. p. 83.

Theſe and a multitude of other learned Men, found ſufficient reaſon to believe the *Perſonality* of the Holy *Spirit* by the conſideration of ſeveral *Actions*, which are clearly aſcribed unto him, even ſuch *Actions*, as are *proper* and peculiar to *Perſons* only. 'Tis evident that the Spirit is ſaid to reprove, to teach, to guide, to quicken, to ſanctifie, to diſtribute Gifts and Graces in what meaſure and to whom he pleaſeth; theſe and other Actions with ſome diſpoſitions too, aſcribed to the Spirit, ſince they cannot belong to *Qualities*, do abundantly evince his *Perſonality*.

But

But that ſuch *Perſonal Actions*, aſcribed to the bleſſed *Spirit*, do indeed prove him to be a *Perſon*, our *Socinians* will not grant; for, ſay they, and truly too, Perſonal Actions, in other caſes, and in other Texts, are clearly aſcribed to *things*, which are not *Perſons*. *Solomon* tells us, *Wiſdom crieth without, ſhe uttereth her voice in the Streets.* To cry and utter a voice is a *Perſonal* Action, and yet 'tis here aſcribed to *Wiſdom*, which is no *Perſon*: St. *Paul* ſaith of Charity, *It beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* Theſe and other Actions, which are proper to *Perſons*, are attributed to *Charity*, which is no more than a Gracious *diſpoſition*, quality, or habit. And indeed 'tis uſual in all ſorts of Authors to aſcribe thoſe Actions, whether good or bad, which any Perſon doth, to thoſe inward *Principles*, by vertue whereof he

Prov. 1. 20.

1 Cor. 13. 7.

doth them. And ſuch a *Metonymy* or *Proſopopœia*, do our *Socinians* urge to enervate thoſe Arguments, which are drawn from the Divine *operations* of the Holy Spirit, to prove his Deity.

That ſuch Actions are clearly aſcribed to the *Spirit*, as are peculiar to *God* alone, our *Socinians* cannot deny, and from ſuch Actions, being *Perſonally* his, the Fathers do juſtly conclude his *God head*. So *Athanaſius*, ὧν αὐτὴ ἐνέργεια, αὐτὴ ἡ φύσις, where there is the ſelf-ſame *Operation*, there is the ſelf-ſame *Nature* too. And ſo *Gregory Nyſſen*, Τῆς ἐνεργείας ταυτότης ὅτι Πατρός τε καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος δείκνυσι σαφῶς τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπαράλλακτον, The *Identity* of *Operation* betwixt the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, doth manifeſtly ſhew the *Identity* of their *Nature*.

Athan. in dial. adv. Maced. p. 272.

Greg. Nyſſen. de Trin. p. 445.

Now, becauſe the force of this Argument cannot be eſcaped by

a

a downright *denial*, our *Socinians* found themſelves concerned to think of ſome *Evaſion*, and fixed upon this; they tell us, that thoſe Divine Actions, which are *figuratively* aſcribed to the *Spirit*, were *really* done by *God* the *Father*; for, ſay they, the *Spirit* is nothing elſe, but Δύναμις Θεοῦ, the working and effectual *Power* of *God*; and to this *Spirit* ſuch and ſuch works are aſcribed. Not that this Spirit is a *Perſon* ſubſiſting in and operating of himſelf, but by a *Metonymy* or *Proſopopœia*, becauſe he is the *Power*, by which God the *Father* doth the works.

But this ſlender pretence of our *Socinians* is clearly overthrown and utterly baffled by the Pen of a late and very learned *Biſhop* of our own Church, who, to the ſatisfaction of all ſober Men, and to the ſhame of theſe πνευματομάχων, hath unanſwerably demonſtrated, that there are ſeveral

Pearſonus in Expoſit. Symboli Apoſtol.

veral Actions aſcribed to the bleſſed *Spirit*, which can never be aſcribed to God the *Father*. The Spirit is ſaid *to make Interceſſion for us*, but that the *Father* cannot be ſaid to do; for, with whom can he be thought to Intercede? Again, the Spirit is ſaid to be *ſent* by the *Father* and the *Son*; but the *Father* himſelf cannot be ſaid to be *ſent*, and to come as being ſent, as the Spirit doth; for, who ſhould *ſend* him? Yet once more, our Lord ſaith of the Spirit, *He ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf, but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak.* This cannot be ſaid of God the *Father*; for, whatever he *ſpeaks*, whatever he *doth*, he *ſpeaks* and *doth* of himſelf.

Since therefore ſuch and ſuch Actions are aſcribed to the *Spirit*, which cannot be attributed to God the *Father*; this pretence of a *Proſopopœia* is altogether inſuffi-

insufficient; because the *Spirit*, considered, as our *Socinians* represent him, namely and only as a *powerful quality* or Energy, by which God the *Father* Acts, cannot be thought to do such Actions, as are by no means applicable to God the *Father*.

And as those Operations, which cannot be imputed to God the *Father*, do prove the *Spirit*, which doth them, to be a *Person* distinct from the Father; so his Glorious *Attributes* and many Divine *Operations*, do prove him to be a *Person Equal* to the *Father*. For, that he is *Coeternal* with him, is a truth warranted by several Texts, and accordingly testified by *Gregory Nazianzen*, who writes of him thus; Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἦν μὲ ἀεὶ, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἔσται, ὅτε ἀρξάμενον, ὅτε παυσόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συντεταγμένον καὶ συναριθμούμενον, The *Holy Spirit* alway was, is, and will be, without beginning, without Nazianz. Or. 44. p. 711.

out

out end, Co-ordinate and reckoned in the ſame rank with the *Father* and *Son*. That he is Omnipotent, the ſame Father teſtifieth by vertue of ſeveral Texts, and doth thus evince it; Τὸ πνεῦμα συωδημιυργεῖ υἱῷ καὶ τῇ κτίσιν, καὶ τῇ ἀνάςαπν, The *Spirit* had a joynt hand with the *Son* in the works of *Creation*, and will have in the work of the *Reſurrection* too. St. *Cyprian* ſaith of him, *Solo nutu perficit omnia; quod dicit, facit; quod jubet, implet; regit, componit, conſummat, perficit.* And *Irenæus* thus, *Deus per verbum & Spiritum ſuum omnia faciens, diſponens, & gubernans.* All which Expreſſions do import the Spirit's Intereſt and Almighty Power in creating, preſerving, ordering, and governing the World.

Nazianz. Or. 44. p. 714.

Cyprian de SP. S. p. 346.

Iren. adv. Hær. l. 1. c. 19.

And by theſe and ſome other Divine Attributes and Operations was St. *Cyril* induced to ſay, τὸ πνεῦμα σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ τῇ τῆ θεότη-

Cyril. Hieroſol. Cat. 4. p. 30.

τος

τῷ δόξῃ τετίμηται· The *Spirit*, with the *Father* and the *Son*, is honoured with that Glory, which juſtly belongs to the God-head. And ſo *Nazianzen*, πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὁμοθοσιά τε καὶ ὁμόδοξα· We believe on the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, as being of the *ſame Eſſence*, Subſtance, and Glory. Nazianz. Orat. 32. pag. 520.

And here I may take occaſion to anſwer that ſawcy Queſtion, which was once propounded by a *Macedonian* Heretick; τίς προσεκύνησε τῷ πνεύματι; τίς ἢ τῶν παλαιῶν ἢ τῶν νέων, τίς προσηύξατο; πῦ τὸ χρῆναι προσκυνεῖν ἢ προσεύχεσθαι γέγραπται; Who ever worſhipped the Spirit? Who amongſt the Ancients? Who of the *Neotericks*? Who ever prayed to him? Where is it written, that we ought ſo to do? To this bold Demand I anſwer, That for our worſhipping the *Holy Spirit* we have both Commands and Examples. Naz. Or. 37. p. 599.

1. For

1. For our worſhipping the *Holy Spirit* we have *Commands*; for beſides our Lord's Injunction requiriug us to be *Baptized* into the *Name*, the *Faith*, the *Religion* and *Service* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; every Text which commands us to worſhip *God*, commands us to worſhip the *Spirit* too. For, as *Nazianzen* well determines this matter, ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς προσκύνησις τῶν τριῶν ἐστι προσκύνησις διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶν ὁμότιμον τῆς ἀξίας καὶ τῆς θεότητος· The Adoration of *One God* is the Adoration of the *Three Perſons*, becauſe they are of the *ſame Honour*, Dignity, and Godhead. And whenever we pray to God without a particular Application to this or that particular Perſon, we pray to them *all*, as being *one* and the ſame God undivided.

2. For

2. For our worſhipping the Holy Spirit we have Examples; and ſuch Examples as deſerve and require our Imitation.

That of St. *Paul* is one, who thus concludes one of his Epiſtles, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt, be with you all. Amen.* That theſe Words are a *Prayer*, I think no Man will deny: As ſuch doth *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* own it; and St. *Chryſoſtom* expreſly ſaith of St. *Paul*, εἰς εὐχὴν καταλύει τὸν λόγον. He doth here end his Diſcourſe with a *Prayer*. And if it be a *Prayer*, to *whom* doth St. *Paul* direct it? either to no body, or elſe to the whole *Trinity* in Conjunction. For, as *Grotius* obſerves, *Sunt hic, ut & in Baptiſmo, apertè nomina,* τῆς τριάδος. The whole *Trinity* is here expreſly named, as it alſo is in the Form of Baptiſm; 2 Cor. 13. 14.

ſo

ſo that if St. *Paul* doth here pray at all, he prayeth to the *Father*, to the *Son*, and to the *Holy Ghoſt* too.

And ſince St. *Paul* did direct his humble Petitions for Spiritual Bleſſings to none but God; we may from this Requeſt of his very juſtly infer the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: So thought ſeveral Interpreters of this Text: *Hoc loco diſtincte nobis inſinuantur tres in Divinis Perſonæ:* So one: And thus another; *Notant hic ſignificari Sanctiſſimam Trinitatem* ὁμοούσιον, *conſubſtantialem, eam ſcilicet ejuſdem eſſe naturæ, potentiæ, operationis*, &c. And from this place doth *Gregory Thaumaturgus* draw an Argument, *Quòd venerabilis eſt Sancta Trinitas non ſeparata, nec alienata.* Hence alſo doth St. *Chryſoſtom*, and after him *Theophylact*, break out into this Expreſſion, πῦ δέ ἐσιν οἱ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀθετοῦντες; Where now are they who ſlight the

Eſtius in locum.

Corn. à lap. in locum.

Gre. Thaumat. in Exp. Symboli, p. 101.

the *Spirit*, as if he were not *God*, ſince St. *Paul* himſelf doth here addreſs his ſolemn Petition as well to the *Holy Spirit*, as to the *Father* and the *Son*.

And after the Example of this great Apoſtle, and in a firm Belief, That the bleſſed *Spirit* is *God*, have many pious and judicious Men made their Religious Addreſſes to him; particular Inſtances I have already named; as that of *Nazianzen*, παρέσω μοὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ δώσω λόγον. And again, πνεῦμα φαεινόν· Μὴ μὲ λίπης· And that of St. *Cyprian*, *Adeſto*, *Sancte Spiritus*, &c. Nor did *particular* Perſons only thus invocate the *Holy Spirit* in their *private Devotions*; but *whole Congregations* did ſo in their *publick Supplications* too; ſuch a Prayer I find in that *Liturgy*, which is aſcribed to St. *Chryſoſtom*, and is extant amongſt his Works, wherein God Almighty is petitioned thus,

Chryſoſt. Liturg. tom. 6. p. 986

thus, τὰς οἰκτιρμὰς σε δώρησαι τοῖς δέλοις σε τοῖς ἐπικαλεμένοις τὸ ὄνομά σε, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίε πνεύματος. Grant thy Mercies to thy Servants, who call on thy Name, even the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*. And as the *Holy Ghoſt* was thus particularly mentioned in their Publick *Supplications*; ſo was he as particularly named in their Publick *Thanksgivings* too: So I find it in that *Doxology*, which is repeated over and over: Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον ὄντι προσκυνεῖν πατέρα, υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἀχώριςον. It is meet and juſt to adore the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*, that Trinity of Perſons, which is *Conſubſtantial* and Indiviſible. To this I may add that *Euchariſtical* Appendix to the *Te Deum*, cited by our late very learned *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh*, *Te Patrem adoramus æternum*,

Uſſerius de Symbolis, p. 2.

num, te ſempiternum Filium invocamus, Teq; Spiritum Sanctum confitemur; Tibi uni Deo in Trinitate debitas laudes & gratias referimus; We adore Thee the *Father* eternal; We invoke Thee the *Son* everlaſting; We acknowledge Thee the *Holy Spirit*; To Thee, *One* God in *Trinity*, we return thoſe Praiſes and Thanks which are due.

And now I could heartily wiſh that all our *Socinians* would ſeriouſly conſider, but not corrupt thoſe Texts which do clearly aſſert the *Divinity* of our bleſſed Saviour and his *Holy Spirit*; ſuch Texts as do moſt expreſly give the *Title* of God to them *both*; ſuch Texts as do plainly aſcribe to them both ſuch *Attributes* and *Operations*, as no *Creature* can be capable of; I wiſh they would conſider the Example of St. *Paul*, and the conſtant Practice of the *Catholick Church* in making their

Religious Addreſſes to them both in their Publick *Supplications* and *Thanksgivings*; That they would no longer reject the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, which is ſo clearly revealed, barely becauſe their own narrow Underſtandings are no more able to comprehend it, than a little Spoon is to contain the Water of the whole Ocean. That they may quit and repent of their Heretical Opinion, leſt they run themſelves into that *Blaſphemy* which, through final Impenitence, will certainly prove irremiſſible. I ſhall conclude this Diſcourſe with that Prayer which I find in the *Liturgy* aſcribed to St. *Chryſoſtom*, Δὸς ἡμῖν ὲν ἑνὶ σόματι καὶ μιᾷ καρδίᾳ δοξάζειν καὶ ἀνυμνεῖν τὸ πάντιμον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς ὄνομά σου, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. Lord, grant to us, that we may with *one Mouth*, and *one Heart* glorifie and praiſe

Chryſoſt. Lit. Edit. Eton. p. 999.

praiſe thy moſt Honourable and Magnificent Name, that of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*: And let every good Man ſay *Amen*; that we may all do it, and that for ever and ever.

F I N I S.

Books lately Printed for Walter Kettilby, *at the Biſhop's Head in St.* Paul's Church-Yard.

1. A Treatiſe, relating to the Worſhip of God; divided into Six Sections: Concerning 1ſt. The Nature of Divine Worſhip. 2. The peculiar Object of Worſhip. 3. The true Worſhippers of God. 4. Aſſiſtance requiſite to Worſhip. 5. The Place of Worſhip. 6. The Solemn time of Worſhip. By *John Templer*, D. D.

2. A Defence of revealed Religion; in Six Sermons, upon *Romans* 1. 16. Wherein it is clearly and plainly ſhewn, That no Man can poſſibly have any real Ground or Reaſon to be aſhamed of Chriſtianity. By *Henry Halliwell*, M. A. and Vicar of *Cowfold* in *Suſſex*.

3. Miſcellanies; in Five Eſſays: 1. Upon the Office of a Chaplain. 2. Upon Pride. 3. Upon Cloaths. 4. Upon Dealing. 5. Upon General Kindneſs: The four laſt by way of Dialogue. By *Jeremy Colkliers*, A. M.

4. My-

4. Myſteries in Religion Vindicated: or, The Filiation, Deity, and Satisfaction of our Saviour, aſſerted againſt *Socinians*, and others: With Occaſional Reflections on ſeveral late Pamphlets. By *Luke Milbourn*, a Presbyter of the Church of *England*.

5. A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Man, both in his Natural and Political Capacity; both as he is a Rational Creature, and Member of a civil Society: With an Examination of ſome of Mr. *Hobb*'s Opinions relating thereunto. By *Ja. Lowde*, Rector of *Settrington* in *York-ſhire*, ſome time Fellow of *Clare-Hall* in *Cambridge*.

6. Apparatus ad Theologiam, in uſum Academiarum: 1. Generalis: 2. Specialis. Autore *Stephano Penton*, Rectore de *Glympton*, *Oxon*.

7. Guardian's Inſtruction; or, The Gentleman's Romance. Written for the Diverſion and Service of the Gentry.

8. New Inſtructions to the Guardian; ſhewing that the laſt Remedy to prevent the Ruin, advance the Intereſt, and recover the Honour of this Nation. 1. A more ſerious and ſtrict Education of the Nobility and Gentry: 2. To breed up all their younger Sons to ſome Calling

Calling and Employment: 3. More of them to Holy Orders. With a method of Institution from Three Years of Age, to Twenty-one.

9. Bishop *Overal's* Convocation Book 1606, concerning the Government of God's Catholick Church, and the Kingdoms of the whole World. 4°.

10. Institutiones Grammaticæ, Anglo Saxonicæ, & mæso-Gothicæ. Auctore *Georgio Hicsio*, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Presbytero. 4°.

11. *Chr. Wasii* Senarius, sive de Legibus & Licentia veterum Poetarum. 4°.

12. Misnæ pars Ordinis primi Teraim titul. septem. Latinè vertit & Commentario illustravit *Gulielmus Guisinus*, Accedit Mosis Maimoradis præfatio, *Edvardo Pocokio* interprete. 4°.

13. *Joannis Antiocheni*, Cognomento Mallalæ, Hist. Chronica, è MS. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ. Præmittitur Dissertatio de Authore. Per *Humph. Hodium*, D. D. 8°.